arXiv:1612.01098v1 [math.AG] 4 Dec 2016

EFFECTIVE FAITHFUL TROPICALIZATIONS ASSOCIATED TO LINEAR SYSTEMS ON CURVES

SHU KAWAGUCHI AND KAZUHIKO YAMAKI

Abstract. For a smooth projective curve X of genus $g \geq 2$, global sections of any line bundle L with $\deg(L) \geq 2g+1$ give an embedding of the curve into projective space. We consider an analogous statement for a Berkovich skeleton in non-archimedean geometry, in which projective space is replaced by tropical projective space, and an embedding is replaced by a homeomorphism onto its image preserving integral structures (called a faithful tropicalization). Let K be an algebraically closed field which is complete with respect to a non-trivial non-Archimedean value. Suppose that X is defined over K and that Γ is a skeleton (that is allowed to have ends) of the analytification X^{an} of X in the sense of Berkovich. We show that if $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$, then global sections of L give a faithful tropicalization of Γ into tropical projective space.

1. Introduction

Let X be a smooth projective curve over a field K of genus g, and let L be an ample line bundle over X. If $\deg(L) \geq 2g+1$, then there exist nonzero global sections $s_0, \ldots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the associated morphism

$$X \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N, \quad p \mapsto (s_0(p) : \cdots : s_N(p))$$

is an embedding into projective space. In this paper, we would like to consider an analogous statement for a Berkovich skeleton in non-archimedean geometry, in which projective space is replaced by tropical projective space, and an embedding is replaced by a homeomorphism onto its image preserving integral structures (called a faithful tropicalization). In [32], we consider a version of this statement for higher dimensional varieties.

In the following, we assume that K is an algebraically closed field which is complete with respect to a non-trivial non-Archimedean value. We set $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. The N-dimensional tropical projective space is defined to be $\mathbb{TP}^N = (\mathbb{T}^{N+1} \setminus \{(\infty, \ldots, \infty)\})/\sim$, where $(x_0, \ldots, x_N) \sim (y_0, \ldots, y_N)$ if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $y_i = x_i + c$ for any i (see [36]).

Let X^{an} denote the analytification of X in the sense of Berkovich, and let Γ be a skeleton (which is allowed to have ends) of X^{an}; Γ is a closed subset of $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$ and has an integral structure (see §2.2 for details). We say that Γ has a *faithful tropicalization associated to the linear system* $|L|$ if there exist nonzero global sections $s_0, \ldots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$ satisfying the following property: If

$$\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{TP}^N, \quad p = (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto (-\log|s_0(p)| : \cdots : -\log|s_N(p)|) \tag{1.1}$$

denotes the associated morphism, then the restriction of φ to Γ is a homeomorphism onto its image preserving integral structures. (See §2.7 for details.)

The following is our main result.

Date: 4/December/2016.

The first named author partially supported by KAKENHI 15K04817 and 25220701, and the second named author partially supported by KAKENHI 26800012.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 7.9)**.** *Let K be an algebraically closed field which is complete with respect to a non-trivial non-Archimedean value. Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g, let Γ be a skeleton of X^{an}, and let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that*

$$\deg(L) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g = 0, \\ 3 & \text{if } g = 1, \\ 3g-1 & \text{if } g \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then Γ has a faithful tropicalization associated to $|L|$.

If $g \geq 2$, then $3\deg(\omega_X) = 3(2g-2) \geq 3g-1$. As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following result on tropicalization associated to the pluri-canonical systems.

Corollary 1.2. *Let K, X, and Γ be as in Theorem 1.1. Suppose that $g \geq 2$. Then Γ has a faithful tropicalization associated to the pluri-canonical linear system $|\omega_X^{\otimes m}|$ for any $m \geq 3$.*

As complementary results, we show that in low genera $g = 0, 1, 2$, the bound in Theorem 1.3 is optimal.

Theorem 1.3 (cf. Propositions 7.10, 7.11, 7.12)**.** *Let K be as in Theorem 1.1. Then there exist a smooth projective curve over K of genus X of genus* 2 (*resp.* 1, 0)*, a line bundle L of degree* 4 (*resp.* 2, 0)*, and a skeleton Γ of X^{an} such that Γ does* not *have a faithful tropicalization associated to $|L|$.*

There are some results concerning tropicalization of skeleta. Katz–Markwig–Markwig [28, 29], Baker–Payne–Rabinoff [7], Gubler–Rabinoff–Werner [23], Baker–Rabinoff [8] showed that, for a smooth projective variety X, there exist nonzero rational functions $f_1, \dots, f_N$ of X such that

$$\psi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{R}^N, \quad p = (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto (-\log|f_1(p)|, \dots, -\log|f_N(p)|)$$

gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ. In particular, if X is a smooth projective curve, L is an ample line bundle over X, and if m is a sufficiently large integer, then $1, f_1, \dots, f_N$ can be regarded as elements of $H^0(X, L^{\otimes m})$, so that Γ has a faithful tropicalization associated to $|L^{\otimes m}|$. Theorem 1.1 tells us that one can bound m effectively in the sense that, for any line bundle L with $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$, Γ has a faithful tropicalization associated to $|L|$.

We remark that the tropicalization map (1.1) is not injective on the whole X^{an}. We also remark that, from a different perspective, Hrushovski–Loeser–Poonen [27] studies if X^{an} is embedded in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$ by a homeomorphism onto its image (forgetting integral structures). In another direction, Haase–Musiker–Yu [24] and Amini [1] study embeddings of tropical curves associated to linear systems. We also remark that integral structures of Berkovich skeleta are of interest in mirror symmetry through the work of Kontsevich–Soibelman [33].

Let us explain ideas of our proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a semistable curve over the ring of integers R of K equipped with an isomorphism $\mathscr{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(R)} \mathrm{Spec}(K) \cong X$, and let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line bundle over $\mathscr{X}$ equipped with an isomorphism $\mathscr{L} \otimes_R K \cong L$. We call such a pair $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ a model of (X, L) over R. Our basic strategy is to construct various models $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{L}_i)$ of (X, L) and take nonzero global sections $\widetilde{s}_{i0}, \widetilde{s}_{i1}, \dots \in H^0(\mathscr{L}_i)$, which we regard as global sections of $H^0(L)$ via the isomorphism $\mathscr{L}_i \otimes_R K \cong L$, i.e., we consider $s_{ik} = \widetilde{s}_{ik}|_X \in H^0(L)$. Then we consider a morphism $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ defined by s_{ik}'s, and we show that φ gives a faithful tropicalization.

We explain in more detail. For simplicity, suppose now that a given skeleton is the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} in X^{an}, which is the associated skeleton of any Deligne–Mumford semistable curve $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ with generic fiber X and does not depend on the choice of such $\mathscr{X}$. Then Γ_{can} carries a natural structure of a compact Λ-metric graph, where $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ denotes the value group of K. Each irreducible component C of the special fiber $\mathscr{X}_s$ gives a point $[C]$ of X^{an} (called the Shilov point associated to C), and to prove Theorem 1.1, we need to, for example, separate such points by global sections of L. A node of $\mathscr{X}_s$ gives a segment e of Γ_{can}, and we need to, for example, separate points in e, or separate a point in e and a point in $\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \setminus e$.

Then our construction of desired global sections of L in Theorem 1.1 is divided mainly into two parts. In the first part, we use a theory of Λ-divisors over Γ_{can}, which has been recently developed (see, for example, [3], [5], [20], [36]). We have the retraction map $\tau : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$, which induces the specialization map $\tau_* : \mathrm{Div}(X) \to \mathrm{Div}_{\Lambda}(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$ from the divisor group on X to the Λ-divisor group on Γ_{can}. We take a divisor $\widetilde{D}$ on X such that $L \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\widetilde{D})$. Using Riemann's inequality, the notion of reduced divisors on metric graphs, and so forth, we construct various Λ-divisors D on Γ_{can} that are linearly equivalent to $\tau_*(\widetilde{D})$. Then, to connect the first part and the second part, we use a Raynaud's type theorem on the surjectivity between principal divisors under the specialization map (see, for example, [3], [4], [8]). In the second part, for each such Λ-divisor D, we construct a "good" Deligne–Mumford model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\sum_C \deg(\mathscr{L}|_C)[C] = D$, where C runs through all the irreducible component of the special fiber $\mathscr{X}_s$ and $[C] \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ is the Shilov point associated to C. Then we construct various "good" global sections $\widetilde{s}$ of $\mathscr{L}$, and we consider the restriction $s := \widetilde{s}|_X \in H^0(L)$. (We also need to consider global sections of $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V})$ for suitable vertical divisors $\mathscr{V}$ of $\mathscr{X}$, which we call stepwise vertical divisors.) Finally, we show that, varying D and $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$, the global sections s's of L give a faithful tropicalization of X.

Let us explain here why $3g-1$ appears, even in a very rough form. First, for the proof, we use Riemann's inequality ($|E| \neq \emptyset$ if $\deg(E) \geq g$) on $\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \subset X^{\mathrm{an}}$, which requires "$g$." Also, to show basepoint freeness and vanishing of cohomologies, we want $L \otimes \omega_X^{-1}$ (or $\mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{-1}$) to be "positive," which requires "$\deg(\omega_X) + 1 = 2g - 1$." Then, combining the two, our method requires "$g + (2g-1) = 3g - 1$." When $g = 2$, Theorem 1.3 tells us that $3g - 1$ cannot be reduced to $3g-2$, thus by our "g plus $(2g-1)$" approach it is difficult to reduce $3g-1$ further. However, a different approach may give a better lower bound for a faithful tropicalization, and it will certainly be an interesting problem to obtain the best lower bound.

Question 1.4. Let $g \geq 3$. What is the best lower bound $d(g)$, which depends only on g, with the following properties? Let X be any smooth projective curve of genus g over K, let L be any line bundle over X, and let Γ be any skeleton of X^{an}. Then, if $\deg(L) \geq d(g)$, then Γ has a faithful tropicalization associated to $|L|$. (Note that Theorem 1.1 gives $d(g) \leq 3g - 1$.)

Remark 1.5. As explained as above, for the proof of Theorem 1.1, we show the existence of "good" divisors on a metric graph, and then we lift them to divisors on a curve under the specialization map. We remark that, albeit from a different perspective, this type of lifting argument is sometimes quite successful in tropical geometry. For example, Cools, Draisma, Payne and Robeva [17] gave a tropical proof of the Brill-Noether theorem. See also [15], [16], [30], [31], for example.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 is preliminary. We recall semistable models and semistable pairs, some known facts on Berkovich spaces and tropical geometry. In particular, we recall the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} for a model. We also give the definition

of a faithful tropicalization. In §3, we introduce the notion of a "good" model. Further, for a given effective divisor on the canonical skeleton of X^{an}, we construct a good model with a line bundle which is associated to a divisor that is a "lifting" of the divisor on the skeleton. In §4, we show several lemmas that are useful for constructing required sections. Then we show that the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} can be embedded into $\mathbb{TP}^N$ locally isometrically (called a unimodular tropicalization). In §5, we construct sections that separate points in Γ_{can}, and establish a faithful tropicalization for Γ_{can}. In §6, we discuss the tropicalization in low genera. In §7, we establish a faithful tropicalization for an arbitrary skeleton with possible ends, thus completing the proof of Theorem 1.1. Here, we also give complementary results.

Acknowledgments. Originally, we essentially worked only over the completion of the algebraic closure of a discrete valued field, and the bound of the degree was $5g-4$. While we were making gradual improvement of our results, we had opportunities to give talks in several conferences and have fruitful discussions. We especially thank Professor Antoine Ducros for helpful discussions, which lead us to work over any algebraically closed field that is complete with respect to a non-trivial non-Archimedean value.

Notation and Conventions. An inclusion $A \subset B$ of sets allows the case $A = B$.

A *variety* over a field k means a reduced separated scheme of finite type over k. (We allow that a variety is reducible.) A *curve* is a variety of pure dimension 1. For a curve Y over k, let $\mathrm{Irr}(Y)$ denote the set of irreducible components of Y and let $\mathrm{Sing}(D)$ denote the set of non-smooth points of $D \to \mathrm{Spec}(k)$. A *connected curve D in Y* means a connected union of irreducible components of Y. We denote by $Y - D$ the union of irreducible components of Y other than those in D, that is, $Y - D := \bigcup_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y) \setminus \mathrm{Irr}(D)} C$. A line bundle M on Y is *nef* if $\deg(M|_C) \geq 0$ for any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y)$.

Throughout this paper, K denotes an algebraically closed field which is complete with respect to a non-trivial non-Archimedean value $|\cdot|_K$. We denote by R the ring of integers of K, by $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal of R, and by k the residue field $R/\mathfrak{m}$. Let $v_K : K^\times \to \mathbb{R}$ be the valuation map given by $v_K := -\log|\cdot|_K$, and let $\Lambda := \{v_K(x) \mid x \in K^\times\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the value group of K.

In this paper, we use notions on graphs. A *finite graph* G means a finite connected graph (that is allowed to have loops and multiple edges), and we denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ the set of vertices and the set of edges, respectively. We assign each edge $e \in E(G)$ length in Λ. Then the graph G assigned with edge lengths gives a Λ-metric graph Γ together with the set of vertices $V(G)$ and the set of edges $E(G)$. A *Λ-metric graph* Γ is a connected metric graph such that there exists a finite graph G assigned with edge lengths in Λ that induces Γ as above. Such G is called a *Λ-rational model* of Γ.

Let Γ be a Λ-metric graph with a set V of vertices and a set E of edges. We naturally regard V as a finite subset of Γ and each $e \in E$ as a closed subset of Γ. We take any $e \in E$ and set $\partial e := e \cap V$. We call a vertex in ∂e an *end vertex* of e, and we define the *relative interior of e* by

$$\mathrm{relin}(e) := e \setminus \partial e.$$

If e is isometric to a closed interval, then $\#\partial e = 2$; if e is a loop, then $\#\partial e = 1$.

A point $x \in \Gamma$ is a *Λ-valued point* if the distance from x to one (hence any) vertex v of one (hence any) Λ-rational model G of Γ lies in Λ. We denote by Γ_Λ the set of Λ-valued points of Γ.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, after recalling semistable models and semistable pairs, we briefly review some facts from Berkovich spaces and tropical geometry, which we use later. Then we define a unimodular and a faithful tropicalization associated to a linear system. Our basic references for Berkovich spaces and skeleta are [6], [21, § 5], and [23, § 3]. We use the language of schemes (rather than formal schemes), which might be more familiar for readers in algebraic geometry, even though actual proofs use formal geometry.

2.1. **Semistable models and semistable pairs.** This subsection is mainly to fix the notation. We recall semistable curves, semistable models and semistable pairs.

Semistable curves. We first recall the notion of semistable curves over schemes. Let S be a scheme. A *semistable curve* of genus $g \geq 0$ over S is a proper flat morphism $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to S$ whose geometric fibers $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$ are reduced, separated, connected, 1-dimensional schemes that has only ordinary double points (called nodes) as singularities and satisfies $\dim H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}}) = g$. A semistable curve $\mathscr{X}$ over a scheme S is said to be *strictly semistable*, if, for any scheme point s of S, any singular point of $\mathscr{X}_s$ is defined over the residue field $\kappa(s)$ and any irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ is geometrically irreducible and smooth.

For $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, we say that p is of *connected type* if the partial normalization $\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}$ of $\mathscr{X}_s$ at p is connected; we say that p is of *disconnected type* if otherwise.

A line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ over $\mathscr{X}$ is *vertically nef* if $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}}$ is nef for all geometric fibers $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$. A semistable curve is a *Deligne–Mumford semistable curve* if $g \geq 2$ and if the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\mathscr{X}/S}$ is vertically nef. A Deligne–Mumford semistable curve is a Deligne–Mumford *stable* curve (or simply a *stable* curve) if $\omega_{\mathscr{X}/S}$ is ample.

Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a semistable curve over a scheme S. An irreducible component C of $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$ is a (-1)-*curve* if $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\#(C \cap (\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}} - C)) = 1$, and is a (-2)-*curve* if $C \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\#(C \cap (\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}} - C)) = 2$. If E is a connected curve in $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$ such that each irreducible component is a (-2)-curve, then E is a chain, which we call a (-2)-*chain*. By the adjunction formula, an irreducible component C of $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$ is a (-1)-curve if and only if $\deg(\omega_{\mathscr{X}/S}\big|_C) = -1$, and C is a (-2)-curve if and only if $\deg(\omega_{\mathscr{X}/S}\big|_C) = 0$. If $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$ does not contain a (-1)-curve (e.g. when $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable), a union E of irreducible components is a (-2)-chain if and only if E is connected and $\deg(\omega_{\mathscr{X}/S}\big|_E) = 0$.

Let E be a (-2)-chain in $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}}$. We say that E is *of connected type* if $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}} - E$ is connected, and E is *of disconnected type* if $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}} - E$ is disconnected. Note that if $\mathscr{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford semistable curve and E is of disconnected type, then $\mathscr{X}_{\bar{s}} - E$ consists of two connected components each of whose arithmetic genus is positive.

A (-2)-chain E is called a *maximal* (-2)-chain if F is a (-2)-chain with $E \subset F$, then $E = F$.

Semistable models. Let X be a variety over K. A *model of X over R* is a flat morphism $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ of finite type equipped with an identification of the generic fiber of π with X. When X is proper over K, we require that a model be also proper over R. The special fiber of $\mathscr{X}$ is denoted by $\mathscr{X}_s$.

For two models $\mathscr{X}'$, $\mathscr{X}$ of X over R, we say that $\mathscr{X}'$ *dominates* $\mathscr{X}$ if the identity morphism on X extends to a morphism $\mu : \mathscr{X}' \to \mathscr{X}$.

Now let X be a smooth projective curve over K. A *semistable model* of X over R is a model $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a semistable curve. If a semistable model $\mathscr{X}$ is strictly semistable, then $\mathscr{X}$ is said to be a *strictly* semistable model.

If $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable (resp. Deligne–Mumford stable), then $\mathscr{X}$ is said to be a *Deligne–Mumford* semistable (resp. Deligne–Mumford stable) model of X. By [14, Theorem 7.1] or [6, Corollary 4.23 and Remark 4.24], there exists a unique Deligne–Mumford stable model of X. We denote the Deligne–Mumford stable model of X by $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. It is known that the stable model is "minimal" in the sense that if $\mathscr{X}$ is any semistable model of X, then $\mathscr{X}$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$.

Let L be a line bundle over X. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a model of X over R. We would often like to consider a line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ over $\mathscr{X}$ extending L. We say that a line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ over $\mathscr{X}$ is a *model* of L if $\mathscr{L}|_X = L$. In this case, we say that a pair $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ is a *model* of (X, L). If $\mathscr{X}$ is semistable (resp. strictly semistable, Deligne–Mumford semistable, Deligne–Mumford stable), we say that $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ is a *semistable* (resp. *strictly semistable*, *Deligne–Mumford semistable*, *Deligne–Mumford stable*) model of (X, L).

Strictly semistable pairs. Let X be a smooth projective curve over K. Let $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a semistable model of X. For a section $\sigma : \mathrm{Spec}(R) \to \mathscr{X}$ of π, we denote the image of σ by $\sigma(R)$ and the image of the special point of $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ by $\sigma(k)$.

Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ be sections of π. The pair $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ is called a *semistable pair* if $\sigma_i(R)$ is contained in the smooth locus of π and $\sigma_i(k) \neq \sigma_j(k)$ for $i \neq j$. Furthermore, the pair is called a *strictly semistable pair* if, in addition, $\mathscr{X}$ is strictly semistable.

We note that the definition of a strictly semistable pair is the same as in [23]. Indeed, since $\sigma_i(R)$ is contained in the smooth locus of π, $\sigma_1(R), \dots, \sigma_r(R)$ are prime Cartier divisors on $\mathscr{X}$, and by the condition $\sigma_i(k) \neq \sigma_j(k)$ for $i \neq j$, these Cartier divisors have disjoint supports.

A strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ is said to be *complete* if for any (-1)-curve $E \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, there exists an i with $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $\sigma_i(R) \cap E \neq \emptyset$.

For any strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$, we add sections so that any (-1)-curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$ meets a section. We denote by $\sigma_{r+1}, \dots, \sigma_{r+t}$ the added sections. Then $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r+t})$ is a strictly semistable pair and is complete. We say that $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r+t})$ is a *completion* of $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$.

2.2. **Berkovich spaces.** Let X be a variety over K. For each $x \in X$, let $\kappa(x)$ denote the residue field. Let X^{an} be the *Berkovich analytic space* associated to X. (For details, see fundamental papers by Berkovich [9, 10, 11, 12].) Here we recall X^{an} as a set and the underlying topology of X^{an}. As a set, X^{an} is defined by

$$X^{\mathrm{an}} := \{(x, |\cdot|) \mid x \in X \text{ and } |\cdot| \text{ is an absolute value of } \kappa(x) \text{ extending } |\cdot|_K\}.$$

The *Berkovich topology* on X^{an} is the weakest topology such that for any Zariski open subset U of X and for any regular function $g \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, the map $\iota^{-1}(U) \to \mathbb{R}, (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto |g(p)|$ is continuous, where $\iota : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to X$ is the natural map given by $(p, |\cdot|) \mapsto p$.

The set $X(K)$ of K-valued points are naturally regarded as points of X^{an} via $x \mapsto (x, |\cdot|_K)$ for $x \in X(K)$, where $|\cdot|_K$ is the original value on $K = \kappa(x)$. Those points are called *classical points*. It is known that $X(K)$ is dense in X^{an}.

There is another class of points of X^{an}, called the *Shilov points*. Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a model of X. Assume that any irreducible component of the special fiber $\mathscr{X}_s$ is reduced. Let C be an irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ and let ξ be the generic point of C. Then one associates a unique absolute value $|\cdot|_C$ on $K(X)$, which is characterized by for any $f \in K(X)$,

$$|f|_C = \inf\{|a| \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \in K^\times, a^{-1} f \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X},\xi}\}.$$

Thus C gives a point $[C]$ of X^{an}, which we call the *Shilov point* associated to $(\mathscr{X}, C)$, or simply to C. A Shilov point associated to $(\mathscr{X}, C)$ for some irreducible component C of $\mathscr{X}_s$

is called a *Shilov point with respect to* $\mathscr{X}$. In this paper, let $V(\mathscr{X})$ denote the set of Shilov points with respect to $\mathscr{X}$. If $\mathscr{X}' \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is another model of X with reduced special fiber and with a surjective morphism $\mathscr{X}' \to \mathscr{X}$, then we have $V(\mathscr{X}) \subset V(\mathscr{X}')$. A point which is a Shilov point with respect to some model is called a *Shilov point*.

Remark 2.1. Let $x \in X^{\mathrm{an}}$ be a Shilov point. Then for any $f \in K(X)^{\times}$, we have $-\log|f(x)| \in \Lambda$. One sees this from the maximum modulus principle [13, Proposition 6.2.1/4] with the description [6, § 2.3] or from the description of Val in [21, §5.3].

Reduction map. We recall the reduction map associated to a model $\mathscr{X}$ of X. Here we assume that X is proper over K. Let $(x, |\cdot|)$ be a point of X^{an}. Then we have a natural morphism $\mathrm{Spec}(\kappa(x)) \to \mathscr{X}$. Let V be the ring of integers of $\kappa(x)$ with respect to $|\cdot|$. Since V is a valuation ring and $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is proper, the morphism $\mathrm{Spec}(\kappa(x)) \to \mathscr{X}$ extends uniquely to a morphism $\mathrm{Spec}(V) \to \mathscr{X}$. Let $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(x, |\cdot|) \in \mathscr{X}_s$ be the image of the special point of $\mathrm{Spec}(V)$ by this morphism. The assignment $(x, |\cdot|) \to \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(x, |\cdot|)$ defines a map $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}} : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathscr{X}_s$. We call this map the *reduction map associated to* $\mathscr{X}$.

If $x = (x, |\cdot|_K) \in X^{\mathrm{an}}$ is a classical point and if σ is the corresponding section of the model $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ guaranteed by the valuative criterion, then $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(x) = \sigma(k)$.

2.3. **Skeleta associated to strictly semistable models.** We recall the notion of skeleta. For simplicity, in the sequel, we assume that X is a smooth projective curve, although skeleta can be defined in a more general setting.

Standard model and its skeleton. Let $\varpi \in R$ be an element with $0 < |\varpi| < 1$. We set $\mathscr{S} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi))$, and call $\mathscr{S}$ a *standard model*.

Let $\mathscr{S}_K = \mathrm{Spec}(K[x,y]/(xy-\varpi))$ be the generic fiber of $\mathscr{S} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. We first define the skeleton $S(\mathscr{S}) \subset \mathscr{S}_K^{\mathrm{an}}$. Since $K[x,y]/(xy-\varpi) \cong K[y^{\pm}]$, we regard an element of $K[x,y]/(xy-\varpi)$ as a Laurent polynomial of y. For any $v \in [0, -\log|\varpi|]$, one constructs a unique value $|\cdot|_v$ on the function field of $K[x,y]/(xy-\varpi)$ such that, for any Laurent polynomial $f = \sum_m a_m y^m$, we have

$$|f|_v = \max_m \{|a_m| \exp(-vm)\}.$$

Let η be the generic point of $\mathscr{S}$. The assignment $v \to (\eta, |\cdot|_v)$ gives a map $[0, -\log|\varpi|] \to \mathscr{S}_K^{\mathrm{an}}$. It is known that this map is continuous and injective. The *skeleton* $S(\mathscr{S})$ of $\mathscr{S}$ is defined by the image of this map. Then the map $[0, -\log|\varpi|] \to S(\mathscr{S})$ is a homeomorphism with inverse

$$(\eta, |\cdot|_v) \mapsto -\log|\cdot|_v. \tag{2.2}$$

Thus $S(\mathscr{S})$ has a structure of 1-simplex via the homeomorphism $[0, -\log|\varpi|] \cong S(\mathscr{S})$. One sees that the end points of $S(\mathscr{S})$ are the Shilov points corresponding to the irreducible components of $\mathscr{S}_s$.

Local étale atlas that distinguishes a node. Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. We take any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Then there exist $C, C' \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ such that $C \neq C'$ and $p \in C \cap C'$. By the same argument as in the proof of [6, Proposition 4.3], one can take an open neighborhood of p in $\mathscr{X}$ and an étale morphism from this open subset to a standard model. Furthermore, replacing the open neighborhood by a smaller one, we can take an affine open neighborhood $\mathscr{U}_p \subset \mathscr{X}$ of p, an element $\varpi_p \in R$ with $0 < |\varpi_p| < 1$, and an étale morphism $\psi_p : \mathscr{U}_p \to \mathscr{S} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi_p))$ such that the special fiber $\mathscr{U}_p \cap \mathscr{X}_s$ consists of exactly two irreducible components and p is a unique node of $\mathscr{U}_p \cap \mathscr{X}_s$ (cf. [21, Proposition 5.2]). We call ψ_p a *local étale atlas that distinguishes* p.

Definition 2.2 (multiplicity)**.** We call $v_K(\varpi_p)$ the *multiplicity* (of $\mathscr{X}$) at $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_p)$. The multiplicity $v_K(\varpi_p)$ depends only on p, and independent of the choice of $\mathscr{U}_p$.

Skeleton $S(\mathscr{X})$ associated to $\mathscr{X}$. Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. The *canonical 1-simplex corresponding to p* is a closed subset $\Delta_p \subset X^{\mathrm{an}}$ characterized by the following conditions.

(a) For any local étale atlas $\psi_p : \mathscr{U}_p \to \mathscr{S} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi_p))$ that distinguish p, we have $\Delta_p \subset U_p^{\mathrm{an}}$, where U_p is the generic fiber of $\mathscr{U}_p \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$.
(b) The restriction to Δ_p of the induced map $\psi_p^{\mathrm{an}} : U^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathscr{S}_K^{\mathrm{an}}$ gives a homeomorphism $\Delta_p \to S(\mathscr{S})$.

Note that the end points Δ_p are the Shilov points which correspond to the irreducible components of the special fiber of $\mathscr{U}$.

Definition 2.3 (Skeleton associated to a model)**.** The *skeleton* $S(\mathscr{X})$ associated to $\mathscr{X}$ is defined to be

$$S(\mathscr{X}) = \bigcup_{p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \Delta_p,$$

which is a compact subset of X^{an}.

One sees that for any $p_1, p_2 \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, we have $\Delta_{p_1} = \Delta_{p_2}$ if and only if $p_1 = p_2$; if $p_1 \neq p_2$, then $\mathrm{relin}(\Delta_{p_1}) \cap \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_{p_2}) = \emptyset$, where relin means the relative interior, and the points in $\Delta_{p_1} \cap \Delta_{p_2}$ are the Shilov points associated to irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ that contain p_1 and p_2. Thus $S(\mathscr{X})$ has a canonical structure of simplicial set and is regarded as the dual graph of $\mathscr{X}_s$. Note that the set $V(\mathscr{X})\{[C] \mid C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_a)\ \}$ of Shilov points with respect to $\mathscr{X}$ is actually a set of vertices of this simplicial set. Each canonical 1-simplex is called an edge, and we denote by $E(\mathscr{X})$ the set of edges.

It is known that $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$ has a canonical metric structure (cf. [6, Corollary 5.7]). We describe this canonical metric structure on $S(\mathscr{X})$. We take any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ and denote by λ_p the multiplicity at p. The composition of the above homeomorphisms $\Delta_p \to S(\mathscr{S})$ and $S(\mathscr{S}) \to [0, \lambda_p]$ (see (2.2)) gives a homeomorphism $\Delta_p \to [0, \lambda_p]$. Then, with respect to the canonical metric structure on Δ_p induced from $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$, this homeomorphism is an isometry ([6, Theorem 5.15] and [23, § 4]). Furthermore, if C and C' be the distinct irreducible components with $p \in C \cap C'$, and if v and v' be the Shilov points of C and C', then the distance between v and v' equals the multiplicity at p.

Thus the skeleton $S(\mathscr{X})$ has a structure of Λ-metric graph. For a node $p \in \mathscr{X}_s$, a point of Δ_p that lies in $[0, \lambda_p] \cap \Lambda$ via the isometry $\Delta_p \to [0, \lambda_p]$ is a Λ-rational point of $S(\mathscr{X})$ We denote the set of Λ-rational points by $S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X})$. When we write the skeleton as Γ, we write the subset of those points as Γ_Λ, which is compatible with "Notation and convention" in the introduction.

For a connected curve E in $\mathscr{X}_s$, we set $\Delta_E := \bigcup_{p \in E \cap \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \Delta_p$, which we call the *canonical 1-simplex corresponding to E*. Note that if E is a chain in $\mathscr{X}_s$, then Δ_E is isometric to a closed interval of length $\sum_{p \in E \cap \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \lambda_p$, where λ_p denote the multiplicity at p.

2.4. **Skeleta associated to strictly semistable pairs.** We recall skeleta associated to strictly semistable pairs, which generalize skeleta associated to strictly semistable models in §2.3. See also [37].

Standard pair for ends and its skeleton. We set $\mathscr{T} := \mathrm{Spec}(R[y])$ and let $\mathscr{T}_K = \mathrm{Spec}(K[y])$ denote the generic fiber of $\mathscr{T} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. Let τ be a section of $\mathscr{T} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ given by $R[y] \to R[y]/(y) = R$. We call $(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$ the *standard pair for ends.*

One defines the skeleton $S(\mathscr{T}; \tau) \subset \mathscr{T}_K^{\mathrm{an}}$ as follows. For any $v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, one constructs a unique value $|\cdot|_v$ on $K(y)$ such that, for any $f = \sum_m a_m y^m \in K[y]$, we have

$$|f|_v := \max_m \{|a_m| \exp(-vm)\}.$$

Let η be the generic point of $\mathscr{T}$. The assignment $v \to (\eta, |\cdot|_v)$ gives a map $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathscr{T}_K^{\mathrm{an}}$. It is known that this map is continuous and injective. The *skeleton* $S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$ of $(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$ is defined by the image of this map. The map $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$ is a homeomorphism with inverse given by $(\eta, |\cdot|_v) \to -\log |\cdot|_v$.

The point ξ in $S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$ corresponding to $0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is the Shilov point associated to the special fiber of $\mathscr{T}$. We write $\mathrm{relin}(S(\mathscr{T}; \tau))$ for the relative interior of $S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$, i.e., $\mathrm{relin}(S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)) = S(\mathscr{T}; \tau) \setminus \{\xi\}$.

Local étale atlas that distinguishes a section. Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable curve and let σ be a section. Assume that $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma)$ is a strictly semistable pair. Then there exist an affine open neighborhood $\mathscr{U}_\sigma$ of σ, an element $\varpi_\sigma \in R$ with $|\varpi_\sigma| < 1$, and an étale morphism

$$\psi_\sigma : \mathscr{U}_\sigma \to \mathrm{Spec}(R[y]) = \mathscr{T}$$

such that the special fiber of $\mathscr{U}$ is irreducible and $\mathrm{div}(\psi^*(y)) = \sigma(R)$. We call such an étale morphism a *local étale atlas that distinguishes* σ.

Skeleta with ends. One defines the *canonical end* $\Delta(\sigma)$ associated to σ; it is a closed subspace of $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$ which is characterized by the following conditions.

(a) For any local étale atlas $\psi_\sigma : \mathscr{U}_\sigma \to \mathrm{Spec}(R[y]) = \mathscr{T}$ that distinguishes σ, we have $\Delta(\sigma) \subset U_\sigma^{\mathrm{an}}$, where U_σ is the generic fiber of $\mathscr{U}_\sigma$.
(b) The restriction to $\Delta(\sigma)$ of the induced map $\psi_\sigma^{\mathrm{an}} : U_\sigma^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathscr{T}_K^{an}$ gives a homeomorphism $\Delta(\sigma) \to S(\mathscr{T}; \tau)$.

It is known that the endpoint of $\Delta(\sigma)$ (i.e. the point corresponding to $0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$) is the Shilov point associated to the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ that contains the point $\sigma(k)$. The canonical metric structure on $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$ on $\Delta(\sigma)$ gives an isometry of the natural homomorphism $\Delta(\sigma) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Definition 2.4 (skeleton associated to a pair)**.** Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X, and let $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$ be a strictly semistable pair. The *skeleton* $S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$ associated to $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$ is defined to be

$$S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r) := S(\mathscr{X}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \Delta(\sigma_i). \tag{2.3}$$

Definition 2.5 (skeleton of X^{an})**.** A subset Γ of X^{an} is called a *skeleton of* X^{an} if there exists a strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$ such that $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$. We say a skeleton is *complete* if it is associated to a complete strictly semistable pair.

Note that (2.3) makes sense even if $r = 0$, and thus the skeleton associated to a strictly semistable model of X is indeed a skeleton in the sense of Definition 2.5.

One shows that $\mathrm{relin}(\Delta(\sigma_i)) \cap \mathrm{relin}(\Delta(\sigma_j)) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$ and that $\mathrm{relin}(\Delta(\sigma_i)) \cap S(\mathscr{X}) = \emptyset$ for any i. On the other hand, for each $\Delta(\sigma_i)$, the boundary point ξ_i is the Shilov point associated to the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ which meets σ_i, and hence this point belongs

to $S(\mathscr{X})$ as well. Thus $S(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_r)$ is the space obtained by successive one-point sum of $S(\mathscr{X})$ with $\Delta(\sigma_1),\dots,\Delta(\sigma_r)$ at Shilov points associated to the irreducible components that contain $\sigma_1(k),\dots,\sigma_r(k)$, respectively.

The skeleton $S(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_r)$ is equipped with a metric. For each σ_i, we have an isometry $\Delta(\sigma_i)\cong\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We also consider Λ-rational points of $\Delta(\sigma_i)$ via this isometry. Thus one has the notion of Λ-rational points of $S(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_r)$, and we denote the union of the set of those points and $S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X})$ by $S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_r)$. When we write the skeleton as Γ, we write the subset of Λ-rational points as Γ_Λ.

Remark 2.6. For any strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_r)$, one can add sections $\sigma_{r+1},\dots,\sigma_t$ to obtain a complete strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_t)$ (see §2.1). Thus any skeleton is a subset of the skeleton associated to a complete strictly semistable pair.

2.5. **Some properties of skeleta.** In this subsection, we recall some properties of skeleta. Basic references are [6].

Subdivision of a skeleton. As we have seen, a skeleton associated to a strictly semistable model has a structure of a simplicial set such that the set of irreducible components of the special fiber of the model coincides with the set of vertices. Here, we give remarks on the relationship between the subdivision of this simplicial structure and strictly semistable models dominating the given model.

The following propositions are essentially parts of [6, Theorem 4.11]. Indeed, they follow from [6, Theorem 4.11] and the fact that an admissible formal model of smooth projective curve is algebraizable (cf. [19, Proposition 10.3.2]).

Proposition 2.7. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K, and let $\pi:\mathscr{X}\to\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let $\pi':\mathscr{X}'\to\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X that dominates $\mathscr{X}$. We write $\mu:\mathscr{X}'\to\mathscr{X}$ for the morphism extending the identity morphism on X. Let $\{E_1,\dots,E_m\}$ be the set of irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}'_s$ such that each $\mu(E_i)$ is a singleton of $\mathscr{X}_s$, and we assume that $\{E_1,\dots,E_m\}$ consists of (-2)-curves. (Namely, we assume that μ is given by contracting only (-2)-curves.) For $i=1,\dots,m$, let $[E_i]$ be the Shilov point associated to E_i.*

1. *Then $S(\mathscr{X}')=S(\mathscr{X})$ as subsets of X^{an}, and $V(\mathscr{X})=V(\mathscr{X}')\setminus\{[E_1],\dots,[E_m]\}$.*
2. *Let $p\in\operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, and we set $\{q_0,\dots,q_r\}:=\{q\in\operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}'_s)\mid\mu(q)=p\}$. Then $\Delta_p=\bigcup_{i=1}^r\Delta_{q_i}$.*

The next proposition is a converse of Proposition 2.7.

Proposition 2.8. *Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g\geq 2$ over K and let $\pi:\mathscr{X}\to\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let V' be a finite subset of $S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X})$ with $V'\supset V(\mathscr{X})$. Then there exists a unique (up to a canonical isomorphism) strictly semistable model $\pi':\mathscr{X}'\to\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ of X such that $V(\mathscr{X}')=V'$. Further, $\mathscr{X}'$ has the following properties.*

- (i) *There exists a unique morphism $\mu:\mathscr{X}'\to\mathscr{X}$ that extends the identity morphism on X.*
- (ii) *Any $E\in\operatorname{Irr}(\mathscr{X}'_s)$ such that $\mu(E)$ is a singleton is a (-2)-curve.*
- (iii) *$S(\mathscr{X}')=S(\mathscr{X})$ as subsets of X^{an}.*

The next proposition treats (-1)-curves. Recall that, for a connected curve E in $\mathscr{X}_s$, we write $\Delta_E:=\bigcup_{p\in\operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)\cap E}\Delta_p$ in $S(\mathscr{X})$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K and let $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let E be a connected curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that E is a union of irreducible components $E_1, \dots, E_r$ with $E_i \cap E_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-1$. Assume that E_r is a (-1)-curve and E_i $(i = 1, \dots, r-1)$ is a (-2)-curve. We take $E_0 \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s - E)$ with $E_0 \cap E_1 \neq \emptyset$, and we set $\{p_0\} = E_0 \cap E_1$. Let $[E_i]$ be the vertices in $S(\mathscr{X})$ corresponding to E_i. We set $V_1 := V(\mathscr{X}) \setminus \{[E_1], \dots, [E_r]\}$.*

1. *There exists a unique strictly semistable model $\pi_1 : \mathscr{X}_1 \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $V(\mathscr{X}_1) = V_1$. Further, the identity morphism on X extends to a morphism $\nu_1 : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}_1$.*
2. *We have $S(\mathscr{X}_1) \cup \Delta_E = S(\mathscr{X})$ and $S(\mathscr{X}_1) \cap \Delta_E = \{[E_0]\}$.*
3. *Let σ be a section of $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $\sigma(k) \in E_r \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Set $\tau := \nu_1 \circ \sigma$. Note that $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma)$ and $(\mathscr{X}_2; \tau)$ are strictly semistable pair, and let $\Delta(\sigma)$ and $\Delta(\tau)$ be the corresponding canonical ends. Then we have $\Delta(\sigma) \cup \Delta_E = \Delta(\tau)$.*

Retraction map. Let X be a smooth projective curve over K. Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Then we have a unique strongly deformation retraction $\tau : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to S(\mathscr{X})$ that is the identity on $S(\mathscr{X})$. Indeed, one shows that for each connected component B of $X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus S(\mathscr{X})$, and the boundary ∂B consists of a unique point v in $S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X})$, and the closure of B is contracted to v. We call τ the *retraction map* with respect to $S(\mathscr{X})$. Note that the retraction map is also described in terms of valuation map; see [21, §5.3].

Remark 2.10. It is known that $\tau(X(K)) = S_\Lambda(\mathscr{X})$; see [21, §5.3], where τ is denoted by Val.

The following lemma gives us a more concrete description for the retraction map, and relates the reduction map and the retraction map.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}} : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathscr{X}_s$ be the reduction map. Let $x \in X(K)$ with $\tau(x) \in V(\mathscr{X})$ and let C be an irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $[C] = \tau(x)$. Then $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(x) \in C \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.*

Proof. This lemma follows from [21, Proposition 5.7]. □

Canonical skeleton and Deligne–Mumford stable model. Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 1$. Then we have a notion of the *canonical skeleton* Γ_{can} of X^{an}, which is called the minimal skeleton in [6] and uniquely determined from X. It is described as follows: Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be any Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X; then $\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} = S(\mathscr{X})$ as a subspace of X^{an}. Remark that Γ_{can} does not depend on the choice of $\mathscr{X}$.

Furthermore, assume that $g \geq 2$. Then the canonical skeleton has a *canonical* finite graph structure determined by the Deligne–Mumford *stable* model. Let $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ be the stable model of X. As is noted in §2.1, there exists a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model $\mathscr{X}$ that dominates $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$. It follows that the set of Shilov points $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ with respect to $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ is a subset of $V(\mathscr{X})$ (in fact, $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ equals to the subset of $V(\mathscr{X})$ consisting of the Shilov points associated to non-(-2)-curves), and hence $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is also a subset of Γ_{can}. We give Γ_{can} a finite graph structure so that $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is the set of vertices. Let $E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ denote the set of edges with respect to this graph structure. Note that this finite graph may have self-loops in general.

We remark that, for any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s^{\mathrm{st}})$, Δ_p makes sense. Indeed, let $\mathscr{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X and let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}_s^{\mathrm{st}}$ be the morphism extending the identity morphism on X. Let $\{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$ be the set of nodes of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $\mu(q_1) = \cdots = \mu(q_r) = p$. Then $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \Delta_{q_i}$ is a subset of Γ_{can} and does not depend on the choice of $\mathscr{X}$. We set $\Delta_p := \bigcup_{i=1}^r \Delta_{q_i}$. Note that $\Delta_p \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$.

We still keep the assumption that $g \geq 2$. Notice that we use the following convention unless otherwise specified: When we say that v is a vertex of Γ_{can}, this means that $v \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$; when we say that e is an edge, this means that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$, Let $\mathscr{X}$ be any Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X.

2.6. **Tropical geometry.** Let $\mathbb{G}_m^N$ be the algebraic torus of dimension N over K with coordinates $z_1, \ldots, z_N$ and let $\mathbb{G}_m^{N,\mathrm{an}}$ be the associated analytic space. Then we have map

$$\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N} : \mathbb{G}_m^{N,\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{R}^N, \quad p = (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto (-\log|z_1(p)|, \ldots, -\log|z_N(p)|), \tag{2.4}$$

called a *tropicalization map of algebraic torus*.

We extend this tropicalization map from the analytic space associated to projective space to tropical projective space. Here, let us recall the tropical projective spaces. As in the introduction, we set $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. The *$N$-dimensional tropical projective space* is defined to be

$$\mathbb{TP}^N := (\mathbb{T}^{N+1} \setminus \{(\infty, \ldots, \infty)\})/\sim,$$

where $x := (x_0, \ldots, x_N), y := (y_0, \ldots, y_N) \in \mathbb{T}^{N+1} \setminus \{(\infty, \ldots, \infty)\}$ satisfy $x \sim y$ if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $y_i = x_i + c$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, N$ (see [36]). The equivalence class of x in $\mathbb{TP}^N$ is written as $(x_0 : \cdots : x_N)$. Now, let $\mathbb{P}^N$ be the N-dimensional projective space over K with homogeneous coordinates $X_0, \ldots, X_N$ and let $\mathbb{P}^{N,\mathrm{an}}$ denote the Berkovich analytification of $\mathbb{P}^N$. Then we define the tropicalization map to be

$$\mathrm{trop} : \mathbb{P}^{N,\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N, \qquad p = (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto (-\log|X_0(p)|, \ldots, -\log|X_N(p)|). \tag{2.5}$$

The tropicalization map on (2.5) extends that on (2.4), which we make precise now. Remark that tropical projective space is equipped with $(N+1)$ charts $U_i := \{x = (x_0 : \cdots : x_N) \in \mathbb{TP}^N \mid x_i \neq \infty\}$. We set $E := \bigcap_{i=0}^N U_i$. For each $i = 0, \ldots, N$, we have a natural homeomorphism

$$\phi_i : \mathbb{R}^N \to E, \quad (u_1, \ldots, u_N) \mapsto (u_1 : \cdots : u_{i-1} : 0 : u_i : \cdots : u_N).$$

Thus E is an N-dimensional Euclidean space embedded in $\mathbb{TP}^N$. Further, for each $i = 0, \ldots, N$, let

$$\psi_i : \mathbb{G}_m^N \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N, \quad (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \mapsto (z_1 : \cdots : z_{i-1} : 1 : z_i \cdots : z_N)$$

be an open immersion. Then we have $\mathrm{trop} \circ \psi_i = \phi_i \circ \mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}$. Remark that $\mathrm{trop}^{-1}(E) = \psi_i(\mathbb{G}_m^N)$ for any $i = 0, \ldots, N$.

Remark 2.12. Let $i, j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, N\}$. Then we have an homeomorphism $\phi_j^{-1} \circ \phi_i : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$. It is clear from the definition of ϕ_i and ϕ_j that this restricts an isomorphism from $\mathbb{Z}^N$ to $\mathbb{Z}^N$ as $\mathbb{Z}$-modules, i.e., $\phi_j^{-1} \circ \phi_i$ is given by the multiplication of an element of $\mathrm{GL}_N(\mathbb{Z})$.

Let Y be an irreducible closed subvariety of $\mathbb{P}^N$. Fix an $i = 0, \ldots, N$. Then $Y_i^\circ := \psi_i^{-1}(Y)$ is an irreducible closed subvariety of $\mathbb{G}_m^N$. The results of Bieri–Groves and Speyer–Sturmfels (cf. [35] and [22, Theorem 3.3]) describe the polytopal structure of $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$. Although we do not recall their results in full generality, we describe the polytopal structure when $\dim(Y_i^\circ) = 1$, because that is the case we are concerned. In this case, there exists a finite subset $V \subset \mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}}) \cap \Lambda^N$ such that if Σ is the set of closures of the connected components of of $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}}) \setminus V$, then each $\Delta \in \Sigma$ is of form:

(1) $\Delta = \{y + tz \mid t \in [0, \ell]\}$, where $y \in \Lambda^N$, $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ with $\mathrm{GCD}(z_1, \ldots, z_N) = 1$, and $\ell \in \Lambda \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, or;
(2) $\Delta = \{y + tz \mid t \in [0, \infty)\}$ with y and z as in (1).

Using the above illustration, we endow $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$ with a metric structure. Indeed, we put a metric by lattice length: If $\Delta \in \Sigma$ is as in (1) (resp. (2)), then we identify Δ with $[0,\ell]$ (resp. $[0,+\infty)$) via $y+tz \mapsto t$, and with this identification, Δ is a metric space; since $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}}) = \bigcup_\Delta \Delta$, this metric structure does not depend on the choice of Σ and is well-defined for $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$. Thus $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$ is a metric space.

Furthermore, the above metric structure on each $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$ gives a well-defined metric on $\mathrm{trop}(Y^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$. Indeed, for each $i = 0,\dots,N$, since $\mathrm{trop}^{-1}(E) = \psi_i(\mathbb{G}_m^N)$, we have a homeomorphism $\phi_i|_{\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})} : \mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}}) \to \mathrm{trop}(Y^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$, and since $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$ has a metric structure, this homeomorphism induces a metric structure on $\mathrm{trop}(Y^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$. Since the metric on $\mathrm{trop}_{\mathbb{G}_m^N}(Y_i^{\circ,\mathrm{an}})$ is the lattice metric, one sees from Remark 2.12 that this metric structure on $\mathrm{trop}(Y^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$ does not depend on i. Thus $\mathrm{trop}(Y^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$ is a metric space.

Remark that tropical geometry near the boundary $\mathbb{TP}^N \setminus E$ is rather subtle (see [36]). However, for our purposes (i.e., for faithful tropicalizations), we will not need detailed analysis on the boundary, because the tropicalization of a skeleton is contained in E, as we will see in the next subsection.

2.7. **Faithful tropicalization.** Let X be a smooth projective curve over K. Let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that we are given nonzero global sections $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N \in H^0(X,L)$. Associated to those sections, we define a map $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$: Let $\varphi' : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{N,\mathrm{an}}$ be the morphism induced by $p \mapsto (s_0(p) : \cdots : s_N(p))$; we define $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ to be $\mathrm{trop} \circ \varphi'$, where trop is the map in (2.5). We write

$$\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{TP}^N, \quad p = (p, |\cdot|) \mapsto (-\log|s_0(p)| : \cdots : -\log|s_N(p)|)\,. \tag{2.6}$$

Let E be the N-dimensional Euclidean space embedded in $\mathbb{TR}^N$ as in the previous subsection. Note that $\varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)) \subset \varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$. Indeed, since each s_i has zero only at points in $X(K)$, $-\log|s_i(p)| \neq \infty$ for any $p \in X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$, and hence $\varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)) \subset E$.

We describe $\varphi|_{X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)}$ in terms of the coordinates given by the homeomorphism $\phi_i : \mathbb{R}^N \to E$ for $i = 0,\dots,N$. We explain only the case $i = 0$, since the other cases are the same. We identify $E = \mathbb{R}^N$ with ϕ_0. Then

$$\varphi|_{X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)} = \left(-\log\left|\frac{s_1}{s_0}\right|, \dots, \log\left|\frac{s_N}{s_0}\right|\right). \tag{2.7}$$

Let $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ be a skeleton (possibly with ends) and write $\Gamma = \bigcup_{q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \Delta_q \cup \bigcup_{\sigma_i} \Delta(\sigma_i)$ be the decomposition of Γ as in (2.3). Recall that Γ is a metric space: Δ_q is canonically identified with $[0,\lambda_q]$, where λ_q is the multiplicity at q, and $\Delta(\sigma_i)$ is canonically identified with $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. By the definition of Γ, we have $\Gamma \subset X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)$. Since $\varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K)) \subset \varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$, we thus have a map $\Gamma \to \varphi(X^{\mathrm{an}}) \cap E$ between metric spaces by restriction. Thus the following definition makes sense.

Definition 2.13 (unimodular tropicalization)**.** Let X, L, and Γ be as above. Let $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N$ be nonzero global sections of L, and let $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{TP}^N$ denote the associated morphism (2.6). We call φ a *unimodular tropicalization* of Γ if there exists a finite subset $V \subset \Gamma_\Lambda$ such that for the closure Δ of any connected component of $\Gamma \setminus V$, the restriction map $\varphi|_\Delta : \Delta \to \varphi(\Delta)$ is an isometry.

Roughly speaking, a unimodular tropicalization means a piecewise isometry.

Remark 2.14. Let X, Γ, and L be as above. Let $s_0, \dots, s_M, s_{M+1}, \dots, s_N$ be global sections of L ($N \geq M+1$). Let $\varphi_1 : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^M$ be the associated morphism (2.6) to $s_0, \dots, s_M$

and let $\varphi_2 : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ be the associated morphism (2.6) to $s_0, \dots, s_N$. Let e be a connected subspace of Γ. Suppose that $\varphi_1|_e$ is an isometry. Then $\varphi_2|_e$ is also an isometry. Indeed, with the description on (2.7) we have $\varphi_1|_e = \left(-\log\left|\frac{s_1}{s_0}\right|, \dots, \log\left|\frac{s_M}{s_0}\right|\right)$ and $\varphi_2|_e = \left(\varphi_1|_e, -\log\left|\frac{s_{M+1}}{s_0}\right|, \dots, \log\left|\frac{s_N}{s_0}\right|\right)$. Since the metric on the tropicalization is given by the lattice length, one then sees that if $\varphi_1|_e$ is an isometry, then so is $\varphi_2|_e$.

Definition 2.15 (faithful tropicalization)**.** Let X, L, and Γ be as above. Let $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N$ be nonzero global sections of L and let $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{TP}^N$ denote the associated morphism (2.6). We call φ a *faithful tropicalization* of Γ if it is an injective unimodular tropicalization; in other words, the restriction of φ to Γ is a homeomorphism of Γ onto its image preserving the metric.

Remark 2.16. In relation to faithful tropicalizations, we recall the notion of Λ-rational polyhedral complexes and their integral structures, and remark that faithful tropicalizations are exactly homeomorphisms preserving integral structures.

Here we describe Λ-rational polyhedral complexes of dimension at most one. A Λ-rational polyhedron σ in $\mathbb{R}$ of dimension at most one is a subset defined by $\sigma = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid Ax \leq b\}$ for some $A \in M_{r,1}(\mathbb{Z})$ and $b \in \Lambda^r$. A Λ-rational polyhedral complex Σ of dimension at most one on a Hausdorff topological space Y is a finite collection of closed topological spaces $\Delta \subset Y$ such that Δ is homeomorphic to a Λ-rational polyhedron σ in $\mathbb{R}$ of dimension at most one with the following properties: Any face of $\Delta \in \Sigma$ belongs to Σ; and, if Δ and Δ' are in Σ, then $\Delta \cap \Delta'$ (if non-empty) are in Σ. Such a polyhedral complex Σ is said to be of pure dimension one if $|\Sigma| := \{y \in Y \mid y \in \Delta \text{ for some } \Delta \in \Sigma\}$ is connected and not a singleton. A *refinement* of Σ is a Λ-rational polyhedral complex $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ with $|\widetilde{\Sigma}| = |\Sigma|$ such that for any $\widetilde{\Delta} \in \widetilde{\Sigma}$ there exists $\Delta \in \Sigma$ with $\widetilde{\Delta} \subset \Delta$.

Let Σ be a Λ-rational polyhedral complex of pure dimension one on Y. A member $\Delta \in \Sigma$ is said to be zero-dimensional (resp. one-dimensional) if the corresponding Λ-rational polyhedron σ in $\mathbb{R}$ is zero-dimensional (resp. one-dimensional). Let $|\Sigma|_0$ be the union of all $\Delta \in \Sigma$ such that Δ is zero-dimensional, and let $|\Sigma|_1$ be the union of all $\Delta \in \Sigma$ such that Δ is one-dimensional. Then $|\Sigma|_0$ (resp. $|\Sigma|_1$) is naturally a manifold of dimension 0 (resp. 1) with an integral structure. Namely, for $n = 0$, this means nothing but that each member of $|\Sigma|_0$ is identified with a point in $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$. For $n = 1$, this means that there exists an open covering $\{U_i\}$ of $|\Sigma|_1$ and a homeomorphism $\phi_i : U_i \to V_i \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that the transition map $\phi_i \circ \phi_j^{-1}\big|_{\phi_j(U_i \cap U_j)} : \phi_j(U_i \cap U_j) \to \phi_i(U_i \cap U_j)$ is the restriction of the map $x \mapsto cx + d$, where $c = \pm 1$ and $d \in \Lambda$.

Let Σ (resp. Σ') be a Λ-rational polyhedral complex of pure dimension one on Y (resp. Y'). Let $f : Y \to Y'$ be a continuous map. We say that the restriction of f to $|\Sigma|$ is a homeomorphism onto $|\Sigma'|$ preserving integral structures if there exists a refinement $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ of Σ (resp. $\widetilde{\Sigma}'$ of Σ') with the following properties: $|\widetilde{\Sigma}|_0$ and $|\widetilde{\Sigma}'|_0$ are bijective under f; There exist open coverings $\{U_i\}$ of $|\widetilde{\Sigma}|_1$, $\{U_i'\}$ of $|\widetilde{\Sigma}'|_1$ and homeomorphisms $\phi_i : U_i \to V_i \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\phi_i' : U_i' \to V_i' \subset \mathbb{R}$ that give integral structures of $|\widetilde{\Sigma}|_1$ and $|\widetilde{\Sigma}'|_1$ such that $\phi_i' \circ f \circ \phi_i^{-1} : V_i \to V_i'$ is a homeomorphism of the form $x \mapsto cx + d$, where $c = \pm 1$ and $d \in \Lambda$.

Let X, L, and Γ be as above. Let $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N$ be nonzero global sections of L and let $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{TP}^N$ denote the associated morphism (2.6). Then each Γ and $\varphi(\Gamma)$ is equipped with a natural structure of a Λ-rational polyhedral complex of dimension at most one, and φ is a faithful tropicalization of Γ in the above definition if and only if $\varphi|_\Gamma : \Gamma \to \varphi(\Gamma)$ is a

homeomorphism of Γ onto its image preserving integral structures. See [36, §3], [6] and [23, §§2.2–2.3] for more details.

3. Good models

In the proof of the main Theorem 1.1, we need to construct many suitable global sections of a line bundle L over X which will give a faithful tropicalization for a skeleton. In our strategy, we will construct those global sections as global sections of $\mathscr{L}$ for some "good" models $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L). Therefore, we will need to construct various "good" models of (X, L), and to do that, we use the theory of divisors on graphs.

In this section, we firstly define the notion of good models $\mathscr{X}$ of X. This is the prerequisite condition that a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) is "good" (when the genus of X is at least 2). We secondly recall some recent development on the divisor theory on Λ-metric graphs. We thirdly introduce the notion of islands of weighted Λ-metric graphs and prove some positivity result on divisors on Λ-metric graphs. In the last subsection of this section, we introduce the machinery that produces various "good" models $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ which will be crucially used in the arguments. Further, we use this machinery to construct a mode of (X, L) which will be frequently used in the arguments.

3.1. Good models of X.

In this subsection, we define the notion that a model $\mathscr{X}$ of X is "good." On this model $\mathscr{X}$, we will construct a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L).

Let X be a smooth projective curve defined over K, and let $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \operatorname{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Recall from §2.1 that a (-2)-chain is a connected curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$ consisting of (-2)-curves, and it is a *maximal* (-2)-chain if it is maximal with respect to the inclusion among (-2)-chains. Notice that two distinct maximal (-2)-chains are disjoint. Recall also from §2.1 that a (-2)-chain E is of connected type if $\mathscr{X}_s - E$ is connected, and is of disconnected type otherwise.

For a connected curve E in $\mathscr{X}_s$, let $\Delta_E := \bigcup_{p \in E \cap \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \Delta_p$ be the canonical 1-simplex corresponding to E (cf. §2.3). Suppose that E is a (-2)-chain in $\mathscr{X}_s$. Then Δ_E is a circle or a closed line segment in $S(\mathscr{X}_s)$. The irreducible components $C \in \operatorname{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ having the properties that $C \notin \operatorname{Irr}(E)$ and $C \cap E \neq \emptyset$ give points in Δ_E. Those points are the boundary vertices of Δ_E.

Definition 3.1 (symmetric multiplicities)**.** Let E be a maximal (-2)-chain of connected type in $\mathscr{X}_s$. We say that E *has symmetric multiplicities* if it satisfies the following conditions.

(i) $\#\operatorname{Irr}(E)$ is odd and at least 3. Put $\#\operatorname{Irr}(E) = 2\ell - 1$ for $\ell \geq 2$.
(ii) Put $D := \mathscr{X}_s - E$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_{2\ell-1}$ be the irreducible components of E such that $E_{i-1} \cap E_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 2, \dots, r-1$. Let $p_0, \dots, p_{2\ell-1}$ be the nodes of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $\{p_i\} = E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2\ell - 2$, $\{p_0\} = D \cap E_1$, and $\{p_{2\ell-1}\} = D \cap E_{2\ell-1}$. For $i = 0, \dots, 2\ell-1$, let λ_i be the multiplicity at p_i. Then $\lambda_j = \lambda_{2\ell-1-j}$ for $j = 0, \dots, \ell-1$.
(iii) We have $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\ell-1}$. (Thus $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\ell-1} = \lambda_\ell = \lambda_{2\ell-1}$.)

Definition 3.2 (good model)**.** Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$, and let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. We say that $\mathscr{X}$ is a *good model* if it satisfies the following conditions.

(i) The model $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable.
(ii) For any $p \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, there exists a (-2)-chain E such that $p \in E$.
(iii) Any maximal (-2)-chain E in $\mathscr{X}_s$ of connected type has symmetric multiplicities.

We make clear the relationship between a good model $\mathscr{X}$ and the canonical finite graph structure of the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} with the set $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ of vertices and the set $E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$

of edges. Recall that $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ are given by the set of Shilov points of the special fiber $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}_s$ of the Deligne–Mumford stable model $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ of X, and an element of $E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is characterized by the closure of a connected component of $\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \setminus V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. We say that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is *of connected type* if $\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is connected, and $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is *of disconnected type* otherwise.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a good model of X, and let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ be the morphism extending the identity morphism on X.*

(1) *There exist natural one-to-one correspondences between the following three sets:*
$$\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}_s) \longleftrightarrow E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \longleftrightarrow \{\textit{maximal } (-2)\textit{-chain in } \mathscr{X}_s\}.$$
(2) *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ correspond to a maximal (-2)-chain E in $\mathscr{X}_s$ under the natural correspondence in* (1)*. Then e is of connected type (resp. of disconnected type) if and only if E is of connected type (resp. of disconnected type).*

Proof. (1) Since $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable, μ is given by contracting the (-2)-curves of $\mathscr{X}_s$. For $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}_s)$, we set $E := \mu^{-1}(p)$. Since $\mathscr{X}$ satisfies the condition Definition 3.2(ii), E is not a singleton, and thus a maximal (-2)-chain in $\mathscr{X}_s$. This gives a natural one-to-one correspondence between the first and the third sets. For a maximal (-2)-chain E in $\mathscr{X}_s$, we set $\Delta_E := \bigcup_{q \in E \cap \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \Delta_q$ as before. Then $\Delta_E \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$, and this gives a natural one-to-one correspondence between the third and the second sets. Finally, we remark that Δ_p in §2.5 is exactly Δ_E. We have thus the natural correspondences:

$$p = \mu(E) \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \Delta_p = \Delta_E \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad E := \mu^{-1}(p). \tag{3.8}$$

(2) The assertion follows from the definitions of being of connected type and of disconnected type. □

We finish this subsection by introducing the notation which we will frequently use. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a good model of X and let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ be the canonical morphism extending the identity morphism on X. For each $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, let Δ_q denote the corresponding 1-simplex in the skeleton Γ_{can}. Remark that if E is the maximal (-2)-chain with $q \in E$, then $\Delta_q \subset \Delta_E = \Delta_{\mu(q)}$ with the notation in (3.8). For a given compact subset $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$, we set

$$\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset \Gamma_1} := \{q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \mid \Delta_q \subset \Gamma_1\}. \tag{3.9}$$

Remark that for each $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$,

$$\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} = \left\{q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \mid \Delta_{\mu(q)} = e\right\} = \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cap E,$$

where E is the maximal (-2)-chain with $\Delta_E = e$.

3.2. **Theory of divisors on Λ-metric graphs.** As in "Notation and conventions," let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote the value group of K. We review the theory of divisors on Λ-metric graphs, which we use later. Our basic references are Amini, Baker, Brugallé, and Rabinoff [2], Baker and Norine [5], Amini and Caporaso [3], and Baker and Rabinoff [8]. See also [30], [31].

Let Γ be a Λ-metric graph (see 'Notation and conventions"). Let $\mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ be the free abelian group generated by the points in Γ. The elements of $\mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ are called *divisors* on Γ. Any divisor $D \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ is uniquely written as a finite sum $D = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} n_x [x]$ for $n_x \in \mathbb{Z}$. We set $D(x) := n_x$. The *support* $\mathrm{Supp}(D)$ of D is the set of points with $D(x) \neq 0$. The *degree* of D is defined by $\deg(D) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} D(x)$. A divisor D is *effective*, denoted by $D \geq 0$, if $D(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \Gamma$. For a subset S of Γ, we set

$$\deg\left(D|_S\right) = \sum_{x \in S} D(x). \tag{3.10}$$

For a point $x \in \Gamma$, the valency $\mathrm{val}(x)$ denotes the number of segments emanating from x. A *rational function* on Γ is a continuous function $f : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that there exists a finite subset $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of Γ containing $\{x \in \Gamma \mid \mathrm{val}(x) \neq 2\}$ and f is an affine map with integer slopes on $\Gamma \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We denote by $\mathrm{Rat}(\Gamma)$ the set of rational functions on Γ.

For $f \in \mathrm{Rat}(\Gamma)$ and $x \in \Gamma$, we define $\mathrm{ord}_x(f)$ to be the sum of outgoing slopes of f at x. Then $\mathrm{div}(f) := \sum_{x \in \Gamma} \mathrm{ord}_x(f)[x]$ is a divisor on Γ. The set of *principal divisors* on Γ is defined by $\mathrm{Prin}(\Gamma) = \{\mathrm{div}(f) \mid f \in \mathrm{Rat}(\Gamma)\}$.

In studying divisors on graphs, it is often convenient to consider reduced divisors, which we are recalling now. (The notion of reduced divisors was adopted in [5] to prove the Riemann–Roch formula for a finite graph.) For any closed subset A of Γ and $v \in \Gamma$, the *out-degree* of v from A, denoted by $\mathrm{outdeg}^{\Gamma}_A(v)$, is defined to be the maximum number of internally disjoint segments of $\Gamma \setminus A$ with an open end v. For $D \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$, a point $v \in \partial A$ is *saturated* for D with respect to A if $D(v) \geq \mathrm{outdeg}^{\Gamma}_A(v)$, and *non-saturated* otherwise.

We fix a point $v_0 \in \Gamma$. A divisor $E \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ is called a *v_0-reduced divisor* if E is non-negative on $\Gamma \setminus \{v_0\}$, and every connected compact subset A of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_0\}$ contains a non-saturated point $v \in \partial A$ for E with respect to A. It is known that for any $D \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$, there exists a unique v_0-reduced $D_{v_0} \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ that is linearly equivalent to D (cf. [36], [34, Theorem 2.3]).

In this paper, we mainly consider divisors supported in Γ_Λ. We set $\mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma) := \{D \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma) \mid \mathrm{Supp}(D) \subset \Gamma_\Lambda\}$. The elements of this set is called *Λ-divisors* on Γ. For a Λ-divisor D, the complete linear system $|D|$ is defined by

$$|D| := \{D' \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma) \mid D' \geq 0, D' - D \in \mathrm{Prin}(\Gamma)\}.$$

Proposition 3.4. *For any $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for any $v_0 \in \Gamma_\Lambda$, the v_0-reduced divisor D_{v_0} that is linearly equivalent to D is a Λ-divisor. Further, $D_{v_0} \geq 0$ if and only if $|D| \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. We take any $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $v_0 \in \Gamma_\Lambda$. Let $D_{v_0} \in \mathrm{Div}(\Gamma)$ be the v_0-reduced divisor that is linearly equivalent to D. The first assertion $D_{v_0} \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ follows from, for example, Luo's algorithm to construct v_0-reduced divisors in [34].

For the second assertion. it is obvious that if $D_{v_0} \geq 0$, then $|D| \neq \emptyset$. The other implication follows from [34, Corollary 2.18]. □

Let $g(\Gamma)$ denote the first Betti number of Γ.

Proposition 3.5 (Riemann's inequality on a metric graph)**.** *If $\deg(D) \geq g(\Gamma)$, then $|D| \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\deg(D) \geq g(\Gamma)$. Take any $v_0 \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ and let D_{v_0} be the v_0-reduced divisor with $D_{v_0} \sim D$. Since $\deg(D) \geq g(\Gamma)$, the Riemann–Roch formula on metric graphs (see [20, Proposition 3.1], [36, Theorem 7.4], or [26, Theorem 1.2]) shows that there exists an effective divisor that is linearly equivalent to D. By [34, Corollary 2.18], it follows that $D_{v_0} \geq 0$. Further, by Proposition 3.4, we have $D_{v_0} \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$. Thus $D_{v_0} \in |D|$, which shows the proposition. □

Remark 3.6. Let $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $v_0 \in \Gamma_\Lambda$. Let D_{v_0} be the v_0-reduced divisor that is linearly equivalent to D. Then $D_{v_0}(v_0) \geq \deg(D) - g(\Gamma)$. Indeed, we set $E := D - (\deg(D) - g(\Gamma)[v_0]$. Since D is a v_0-reduced divisor, it follows from the definition of v_0-reduced divisor that E is also a v_0-reduced divisor. Since $\deg(E) \geq g(\Gamma)$, Proposition 3.4 shows that $E \geq 0$. Thus $D_{v_0}(v_0) \geq \deg(D) - g(\Gamma)$.

3.3. **Weighted Λ-metric graphs.** In this subsection, we show in Proposition 3.9 the existence of an effective divisor on a Λ-metric graph which will be used to construct good models $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L). Here we use the theory of *weighted* Λ-metric graphs. For a general account of the theory of weighted metric graphs, we refer to Amini and Caporaso [3].

A *weighted* Λ-metric graph $\bar{\Gamma} = (\Gamma, \omega)$ is the pair of a Λ-metric graph Γ and a function $\omega : \Gamma \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that the set $\{x \in \Gamma \mid \omega(x) \neq 0\}$ is finite and contained in Γ_Λ. The function ω is called a weight function. The *genus* of $\bar{\Gamma}$ is defined to be $g(\bar{\Gamma}) := g(\Gamma) + \sum_{x \in \Gamma_\Lambda} \omega(x)$.

Let $\bar{\Gamma} = (\Gamma, \omega)$ be a weighted Λ-metric graph. Since $g(\bar{\Gamma}) \geq g(\Gamma)$, the following follows from Proposition 3.5.

Proposition 3.7 (Riemann's inequality on a weighted Λ-metric graph)**.** *For $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$, if $\deg(D) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma})$, then $|D| \neq \emptyset$.*

Let $\bar{\Gamma} = (\Gamma, \omega)$ be a weighted Λ-metric graph. Assume now that $g(\bar{\Gamma}) \geq 2$ and that there does not exist $x \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 1$ and $\omega(x) = 0$. Then Γ has a finite graph structure with the set of vertices $V(\bar{\Gamma}) := \{x \in \Gamma_\Lambda \mid \mathrm{val}(x) \neq 2\} \cup \{x \in \Gamma_\Lambda \mid \omega(x) \neq 0\}$. Let $E(\bar{\Gamma})$ denote the set of edges.

An edge $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma})$ is called a *bridge* if $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is disconnected. Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\}$ be the set of the bridges of Γ, and we decompose $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e_1) \cup \cdots \cup \mathrm{relin}(e_r))$ into

$$\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e_1) \cup \cdots \cup \mathrm{relin}(e_r)) = \Gamma_1 \amalg \cdots \amalg \Gamma_{r+1},$$

where each Γ_i is a Λ-metric graph (i.e., Γ_i is connected). We set $\omega_i := \omega|_{\Gamma_i} : \Gamma_i \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then $\bar{\Gamma}_i := (\Gamma_i, \omega_i)$ is a weighted Λ-metric graph, and we have $g(\bar{\Gamma}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} g(\bar{\Gamma}_i)$. Since there does not exist $x \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 1$ and $\omega(x) = 0$, we have $g(\bar{\Gamma}_i) \geq 1$ for each i.

Definition 3.8 (island)**.** We call each Γ_i an *island* of a weighted Λ-metric graph $\bar{\Gamma}$.

We show the existence of an effective divisor on Γ whose restriction to each island is not trivial.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\bar{\Gamma} = (\Gamma, \omega)$ be a weighted Λ-metric graph. Assume that $g(\bar{\Gamma}) \geq 2$ and that there does not exist $x \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 1$ and $\omega(x) = 0$. Let $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$. If $\deg(D) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma})$, then there exists $E \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ with the following properties*:

(i) *$E \in |D|$, i.e., E is effective and linearly equivalent to D.*
(ii) *For any island Γ_i of Γ, we have $\deg\left(E|_{\Gamma_i}\right) \geq 1$.*
(iii) *For any bridge $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma})$, we have $\deg\left(E|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) = 0$. For any edge $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma})$ (that is not a bridge), we have $\deg\left(E|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\deg(D) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma})$. We construct such $E \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ step by step. Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_r\}$ be the set of the bridges of Γ.

Step 1. By Riemann's inequality (Proposition 3.7), one has $|D| \neq \emptyset$, so that there exists an effective divisor E_1 with $E_1 \sim D$. The divisor E_1 satisfies the condition (i).

Step 2. In this step, we replace E_1 with E_2 so that E_2 satisfies the conditions (i), (ii), and the first condition in (iii). We are going to show a stronger statement that, for any effective divisor $E_1 \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ with $\deg(E_1) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma})$, there exists an effective divisor $E_2 \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ such that $E_1 \sim E_2$ and $\deg\left(E_2|_{\Gamma_i}\right) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma}_i)$ for any island Γ_i of Γ. Firstly, since any two points on a bridge are linearly equivalent to each other, we may assume that $\deg\left(E_1|_{\mathrm{relin}(e_i)}\right) = 0$ for any bridge e_i $(1 \leq i \leq r)$.

Suppose that $r = 0$, i.e., Γ has no bridge. In this case, Γ is the only island, and we have $\deg(E_1|_\Gamma) = \deg(E_1) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma})$. Thus it suffices to take $E_2 := E_1$.

Suppose that $r \geq 1$. Let v', v'' be the end vertices of e_1. Let Γ' and Γ'' be the connected components of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e_1)$ with $v' \in \Gamma'$ and $v'' \in \Gamma''$. We set $\bar{\Gamma}' = (\Gamma', \omega')$ and $\bar{\Gamma}'' = (\Gamma'', \omega'')$, where $\omega' := \omega|_{\Gamma'}$ and $\omega'' := \omega|_{\Gamma''}$. Since

$$\deg(E_1|_{\Gamma'}) + \deg(E_1|_{\Gamma''}) = \deg(E_1) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma}) = g(\bar{\Gamma}') + g(\bar{\Gamma}''),$$

we may assume without loss of generality that $\deg(E_1|_{\Gamma''}) \geq g(\bar{\Gamma}'')$.

We set

$$E_1' := E_1|_{\Gamma'} + \big(\deg(E_1|_{\Gamma''}) - g(\bar{\Gamma}'')\big)\,[v'] \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma').$$

Then $E_1' \geq 0$ and $\deg(E_1') = \deg(E_1) - g(\bar{\Gamma}'') \geq g(\bar{\Gamma}) - g(\bar{\Gamma}'') = g(\bar{\Gamma}')$.

Since

$$\deg\big(E_1|_{\Gamma''} - (\deg(E_1|_{\Gamma''}) - g(\bar{\Gamma}''))[v'']\big) = g(\bar{\Gamma}''),$$

Riemann's inequality on $\bar{\Gamma}''$ (cf. Proposition 3.7) gives an effective divisor $E_1'' \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma'')$ such that

$$E_1'' \sim E_1|_{\Gamma''} - (\deg(E_1|_{\Gamma''}) - g(\bar{\Gamma}''))[v''].$$

Since Γ' and Γ'' are subgraphs of Γ, we naturally regard E_1' and E_1'' as Λ-divisors on Γ. Since any two points on the bridge e_1 are linearly equivalent to each other, we see that $E_1 \sim E_1' + E_1''$. We replace E_1 with $E_1' + E_1''$.

If $g(\bar{\Gamma}') = 1$ (resp. $g(\bar{\Gamma}'') = 1$), then Γ' (resp. Γ'') is an island of Γ, and we have $\deg(E_1' + E_1''|_{\Gamma'}) \geq g(\Gamma')$ (resp. $\deg(E_1' + E_1''|_{\Gamma''}) \geq g(\Gamma'')$). If $g(\bar{\Gamma}') \geq 2$ (resp. $g(\bar{\Gamma}') \geq 2$), we repeat this argument to $\bar{\Gamma}'$ and E' (resp. $\bar{\Gamma}''$ and E''). Then we obtain $E_2 \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ that satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii). Also, we may assume that $\deg\Big(E_2|_{\mathrm{relin}(e_i)}\Big) = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Step 3. In the final step, we replace E_2 with E_3, so that E_3 satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii). Suppose that e is an edge that is not a bridge and that $\deg\Big(E_2|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\Big) \geq 2$. Let $\gamma : [0, \ell] \to e$ be a parameterization that restricts to an isometry $\gamma|_{(0,\ell)} : (0, \ell) \to \mathrm{relin}(e)$. Then there exist $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 < \ell$ with $E_2 - [\gamma(t_1)] - [\gamma(t_2)] \geq 0$. We set $m = \min\{t_1, \ell - t_2\}$ and $E_2' := E_2 - [t_1] - [t_2] + [\gamma(t_1 - m)] + [\gamma(t_2 + m)] \geq 0$. Then we have $E_2 \sim E_2'$, $\deg\Big(E_2|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\Big) < \deg\Big(E_2|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\Big)$, and $\deg\big(E_2|_{\Gamma_i}\big) = \deg\big(E_2'|_{\Gamma_i}\big)$ for any island Γ_i. Applying this argument for all such e repeatedly, we obtain $E_3 \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ that satisfy the conditions (i)–(iii). □

In the rest of this subsection, we explain how weighted Λ-metric graphs arise as skeleta associated to strictly semistable models of smooth projective curves over K.

Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g and let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let $\Gamma := S(\mathscr{X})$ be the associated skeleton. Recall that we put $V(\mathscr{X}) := \{[C] \mid C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)\}$, the set of Shilov points with respect to $\mathscr{X}$. We define a weight function $\omega : \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ by letting $\omega([C])$ be the geometric genus of $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ and letting $\omega(x) = 0$ for any $x \notin V(\mathscr{X})$. Then $\bar{\Gamma} = (\Gamma, \omega)$ is a weighted Λ-metric graph. One sees that $g(\bar{\Gamma}) = g$. Further, $g(\Gamma) = g$ if and only if ω is trivial.

Example 3.10 (canonical skeleton as a weighted Λ-metric graph)**.** Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g. Suppose that $g \geq 1$. We construct a weighted Λ-metric graph that is canonical for X. Indeed in this case, we have the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} of X^{an}. We take any Deligne–Mumford semistable model $\mathscr{X}$ of X, and we define the weight function ω from $\mathscr{X}$ as above. Note that ω does not depend on the choice of

Deligne–Mumford semistable models $\mathscr{X}$ of X. Thus we obtain a weighted Λ-metric graph $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}} := (\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}, \omega)$ for X. We call $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$ the *canonical weighted skeleton of* X^{an}. Remark that since $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable, one sees that there does not exist $x \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 1$ and $\omega(x) = 0$.

Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g, and now we assume that $g \geq 2$. Then the canonical weighted skeleton $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}} := (\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}, \omega)$ of X^{an} is equipped with a finite graph structure with the set of vertices $V(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}) := \{x \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}\,\Lambda} \mid \mathrm{val}(x) \neq 2\} \cup \{x \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}\,\Lambda} \mid \omega(x) \neq 0\}$. Let $E(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}})$ denote the set of edges. Notice that $V(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}) = V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ and $E(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}) = E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. As remarked in Example 3.10, there does not exist $x \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}\,\Lambda}$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 1$ and $\omega(x) = 0$. Canonical weighted skeleta $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$ for genus $g \geq 2$ are important examples on which one can apply Proposition 3.9.

Remark 3.11. With the notation above, suppose that $g(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}) = g$. Then ω is trivial and $V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) = \{x \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can},\Lambda} \mid \mathrm{val}(x) \geq 3\}$.

3.4. **Good models of** (X, L)**.** Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g. Assume that $g \geq 2$. Let Γ_{can} be the canonical skeleton of X. Let $\tau : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ be the retraction map (cf. the paragraph before Remark 2.10). Since $X(K) \subset X^{\mathrm{an}}$, the restriction of τ to $X(K)$ gives the map $\tau : X(K) \to \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ (still denoted by τ). Since K is algebraically closed, we have $\mathrm{Div}(X) = \mathrm{Div}(X(K))$. By linearity and Remark 2.10, we extend τ to

$$\tau_* : \mathrm{Div}(X) \to \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}).$$

This map τ_* is called a *specialization map*. Note that τ_* preserves degrees and linearly equivalent classes (cf. [4, Lemma 2.1])

Let N be a line bundle over X. We take a divisor $\tilde{D} \in \mathrm{Div}(X)$ with $N \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D})$, and we consider $\tau_*(\tilde{D}) \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$. Since τ_* preserves linear equivalent classes, the linear system $|\tau_*(\tilde{D})|$ does not depend on the choice of $\tilde{D}$. We denote $|\tau_*(\tilde{D})|$ by $|\tau_*(N)|$.

Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. For a line bundle $\mathscr{N}$ over $\mathscr{X}$, we set

$$D_{\mathscr{N}} := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \deg(\mathscr{N}|_C)[C] \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}) \tag{3.11}$$

We show the following proposition, which will be the starting point to construct various good strictly semistable models $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$.

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 2$. Let N be a line bundle over X and let $D \in |\tau_*(N)|$. Then there exists a strictly semistable model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{N})$ of (X, N) with the following properties*:

(1) *$\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2.*
(2) *$D_{\mathscr{N}} = D$.*

Further, if $\mathscr{X}^0$ is a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X, then we may take $\mathscr{X}$ so that $\mathscr{X}$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^0$, i.e., there exists a morphism $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^0$ extending the identity morphism on X.

Proof. **Step 1.** We take $\tilde{D}' \in \mathrm{Div}(X)$ such that $N \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D}')$. We set

$$D' := \tau_*(\tilde{D}') \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}).$$

Then $D \in |\tau_*(N)| = |\tau_*(\tilde{D}')|$. We take a $P \in \mathrm{Prin}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$ such that $D = D' + P$. Remark that our $\mathrm{Prin}_\Lambda(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$ coincides with the group of Λ-rational principal divisors in [8]. Then by [8, Theorem 1.1], which proves Raynaud's type theorem on the surjectivity between principal divisors under the specialization map, there exists a principal divisor $\tilde{P}$ on X such

that $\tau_*(\tilde{P}) = P$. We have $D = \tau_*(\tilde{D}' + \tilde{P})$. Since K is algebraically closed, we write $\tilde{D}' + \tilde{P} = \sum_{i=1}^m P_i$ with $P_i \in X(K)$.

Let $\mathscr{X}^0$ be a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X. Then Proposition 2.8 gives a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model $\pi^1 : \mathscr{X}^1 \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $V(\mathscr{X}^1) = V(\mathscr{X}^0) \cup \{\tau(P_1), \dots, \tau(P_m)\}$. (Note that, since $S(\mathscr{X}^1) = S(\mathscr{X}^0) = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$, $\mathscr{X}^1$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable.)

Step 2. We modify $\mathscr{X}^1$ to obtain a good model. Let $p_1, \dots, p_\alpha \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^1_s)$ be the nodes such that there does not exist (-2)-chain E with $p_i \in E$. Let Δ_{p_i} be the canonical 1-simplex corresponding to p_i. Take a Λ-valued points v_i in $\mathrm{relin}(\Delta_{p_i})$ and put $M_1 := \{v_1, , \dots, v_\alpha\}$. Then by Proposition 2.8, there exists a model $\mathscr{X}^2 \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ of X such that $V(\mathscr{X}^2) = V(\mathscr{X}^1) \cup M_1$. By the construction, $\mathscr{X}^2$ satisfies the condition (ii) in Definition 3.2. Since $M_1 \subset S(\mathscr{X}^1) = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$, $\mathscr{X}^2$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable. Remark that $\mathscr{X}^2$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^1$.

Next, we modify $\mathscr{X}^2$ to make a model that satisfies the condition (iii) in Definition 3.2. Let E be a maximal (-2)-chain of connected type. Put $D := \mathscr{X}^2 - E$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_{r-1}$ be the irreducible components of E with a numbering such that $\#(E_i \cap E_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots r-2$. Let $p_0, \dots, p_{r-1}$ be the distinct nodes such that $\{p_0, \dots, p_{r-1}\} = \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^2_s) \cap E$ where the numbering is given in such a way that $\{p_i\} = E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-2$, $p_0 \in D \cap E_1$, and $p_{r-1} \in D \cap E_{r-1}$. Take $E_0, E_r \in \mathrm{Irr}(D)$ such that $p_0 \in E_0$ and $p_{r-1} \in E_r$ (we may have $E_0 = E_r$). We set $\Delta_E := \bigcup_{i=0}^{r-1} \Delta_{p_i}$ in the skeleton $S(\mathscr{X}^2)$. There exists a unique nontrivial isometry $\iota : \Delta_E \to \Delta_E$ such that $\iota(\partial\Delta_E) = \partial\Delta_E$, and $\iota^2 = \mathrm{id}$, where $\partial\Delta_E$ is the set of end vertices of Δ_E. There exists a unique point $w \in \Delta_E \setminus \partial\Delta_E$ with $\iota(w) = w$.

We can take a finite set of Λ-valued points M_E of $S(\mathscr{X}^2)$ such that $[E_0], [E_1], \dots, [E_{r-1}]$, $[E_r]$, $w \in M_E$ and $\iota(M_E) = M_E$. Note that $\#(M_E \setminus \{[E_0], [E_r]\})$ is odd, and we write this number by $2\ell - 1$. Furthermore, adding Λ-valued points to M_E if necessary, we may and do assume that $\ell \geq 2$ and M_E satisfies the following condition: Let $w_1 (\neq [E_0]) \in M_E$ be a point that is nearest to $[E_0]$ and let $w_{\ell-1} (\neq w) \in M_E$ be a point that is the nearest to w; then the distance between $[E_0]$ and w_1 equals the distance between w and $w_{\ell-1}$.

For all maximal (-2)-chains E of connected type, we take M_E as above, and we set $M' := \bigcup_E M_E$. By Proposition 2.8, there exists a strictly semistable model $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $V(\mathscr{X}) = V(\mathscr{X}^2) \cup M'$ and $\mathscr{X}$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^2$. Since $M' \subset S(\mathscr{X}^2) = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$, $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable. By the construction, $\mathscr{X}$ satisfies the condition (iii) in Definition 3.2. Thus $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2.

Step 3. Finally, we construct a line bundle $\mathscr{N}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ which satisfies the condition of the proposition. Let $P_1, \dots, P_m \in X(K)$ be as in Step 1. We note that $\tau_*(P_i) \in V(\mathscr{X}^1) \subset V(\mathscr{X})$. Let $\sigma_i : \mathrm{Spec}(R) \to \mathscr{X}$ be the corresponding section to P_i guaranteed by the valuative criterion. By Lemma 2.11, for any $i = 1, \dots, m$, there exists a unique $F_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ such that $\sigma_i(k) \in F_i \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, where $\sigma_i(k) = \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P_i)$ by the definition of the reduction map $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}$. Since $\sigma_i(k) \notin \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, $\sigma_i(R)$ is a Cartier divisor on $\mathscr{X}$. We define a line bundle $\mathscr{N}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ to be $\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i(R))$. We see that $\mathscr{N}|_X = \mathcal{O}_X(P_i) = \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D}) \cong N$.

For any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, we have by Lemma 2.11,

$$\deg(\mathscr{N}|_C) = \tau_*\left(\tilde{D}' + \tilde{P}\right)([C]) = D([C]).$$

This shows that $D_{\mathscr{N}} = D$. Thus the model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{N})$ satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii), which completes the proof of the proposition. □

Now, via Proposition 3.12, we construct a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L), which will be frequently used to construct various global sections of L. Recall from the previous subsection

that we have the canonical weighted skeleton $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$ of X^{an} for a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$.

Proposition 3.13. *Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$ over K and let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$. Let $x \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. Then there exist a strictly semistable model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model of X in Definition 3.2 and such that as a divisor on the canonical skeleton Γ_{can},*

$$D_{\mathscr{M}} - [x] \geq 0,$$

where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Further, we may take $\mathscr{L}$ so that the following properties are also satisfied:

(i) *For any island Γ_i of $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$, we have $\deg\left((D_{\mathscr{M}} - [x])|_{\Gamma_i}\right) \geq 1$.*

(ii) *For any edge $e \in E(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}})$ $(= E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}))$, we have $\deg\left((D_{\mathscr{M}} - [x])|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \leq 1$.*

Furthermore, if $\mathscr{X}^0$ is a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X, then we may take $\mathscr{X}$ so that $\mathscr{X}$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^0$, i.e., there exists a morphism $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^0$ extending the identity morphism on X.

Proof. Set $M := L \otimes \omega_X^{\otimes -1}$. We take $\tilde{D} \in \mathrm{Div}(X)$ with $M \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D})$. Since $\deg(M) \geq 3g-1-(2g-2) = g+1$, we have

$$\deg\left(\tau_*(\tilde{D}) - [x]\right) \geq g = g(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}).$$

Then, by Proposition 3.9, we take $E \in \left|\tau_*(\tilde{D}) - [x]\right|$ satisfying the conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 3.9. Now, apply Proposition 3.12 to $E + [x] \in \left|\tau_*(\tilde{D})\right| = |\tau_*(L)|$, and we obtain a good model $\mathscr{X}$ of X and a line bundle $\mathscr{M}$ with $\mathscr{M}|_X \cong M$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} = E + [x]$. Further, if $\mathscr{X}^0$ is a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X, then we may take $\mathscr{X}$ so that $\mathscr{X}$ dominates $\mathscr{X}^0$, i.e., there exists a morphism $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^0$ extending the identity morphism on X. Set $\mathscr{L} := \mathscr{M} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}$. Then, since E satisfies the conditions (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 3.9, it is straightforward to see that $\mathscr{L}$ has the required properties. □

4. Unimodular tropicalization

Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g and let L be a line bundle over X. In this section, we prove that if $g \geq 2$ and $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$, then the canonical skeleton of X has a unimodular tropicalization associated to $|L|$.

4.1. **Useful lemmas.** We begin by showing some lemmas which will be frequently used not only in this section but also in the following sections. We say that a line bundle L is *free* at a point p if p is not a base point of L. We would often like to show that a line bundle is free at a point. The following simple lemma serves for this purpose. Recall that k denotes the residue field of the ring of integers R of K.

Lemma 4.1. *Let D be a semistable curve over k, let L be a line bundle over D, and let $p \in D(k)$. We set $M := L \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1}$.*

(1) *Assume that p is a regular point of D. If $h^0\left((M(-p))^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, then L is free at p.*

(2) *Assume that p is a node of D. Let $\nu : \widetilde{D} \to D$ be the partial normalization of D at p. If $h^0\left(\nu^*\left(M^{\otimes -1}\right)\right) = 0$, then L is free at p.*

Proof. (1) By the Serre duality, $h^0\left((M(-p))^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ is equivalent to $h^1(L(-p)) = 0$. From the exact sequence $0 \to L(-p) \to L \to k_p \to 0$, we then have $h^0(L(-p)) = h^0(L) - 1$. Thus L is free at p.

(2) Let $\mathfrak{m}_p$ be the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_D$ at p. We claim that, if $\mathrm{Hom}\left(\mathfrak{m}_p, \left(L \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1}\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, then L is free at p. Indeed, by the Serre duality, $\mathrm{Hom}\left(\mathfrak{m}_p, \left(L \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1}\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ is equivalent to $h^1(\mathfrak{m}_p L) = 0$ (cf. [25, Theorem III.7.6]). By the same argument as (1) using the exact sequence $0 \to \mathfrak{m}_p L \to L \to k_p \to 0$, we obtain the claim.

As is noted in the proof of [18, Theorem 1.2], we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}\left(\mathfrak{m}_p, \left(L \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1}\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) \cong H^0\left(\widetilde{D}, \nu^*\left((L \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1})^{\otimes -1}\right)\right). \tag{4.12}$$

Thus we get the assertion. □

In view of Lemma 4.1, we would often like to show the vanishing of global sections of a certain line bundle. The following lemmas serve for this purpose.

Lemma 4.2. *Let D be a connected proper reduced curve over k and let M be a line bundle over D. If M is nef and $\deg(M) > 0$, then $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(D)$. Since $\deg(M|_C) \geq 0$, we see that $H^0(M^{\otimes -1}|_C) \neq 0$ if and only if $M|_C \cong \mathcal{O}_C$. We take any $\sigma \in H^0(M^{\otimes -1})$. Then $\sigma|_C \in H^0(M^{\otimes -1}|_C)$ is either zero or nowhere vanishing. On the other hand, there exists $C_1 \in \mathrm{Irr}(D)$ with $\deg(M|_{C_1}) > 0$, and we have $\sigma|_{C_1} = 0$. Since D is connected, we have $\sigma = 0$. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let D be a connected proper reduced curve over k and let M be a line bundle over D. Let E be a curve in D and set $F := D - E$. Assume that $F \neq \emptyset$, $M|_D$ is nef and $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}|_F) = 0$. Then $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$.*

Proof. Our argument is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2. We take any $\sigma \in H^0(M^{\otimes -1})$. For any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(E)$, since $\deg(M|_C) \geq 0$, $\sigma|_C \in H^0(M^{\otimes -1}|_C)$ is either zero or nowhere vanishing. On the other hand, $\sigma|_F = 0$. Since D is connected, we have $\sigma = 0$. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let D be a proper reduced curve over k with at most nodes as singularities, and let M be a line bundle over D. Let E be a curve in D and set $F := D - E$. Regard $\Sigma := F \cap E$ as a Cartier divisor on F. Suppose that $h^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}|_E\right) = 0$ and $h^0\left(\left(M|_F(\Sigma)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. Then $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$.*

Proof. Take any $\eta \in H^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}\right)$. Since $h^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}|_E\right) = 0$, we have $\eta|_E = 0$, so that $\eta|_{E \cap F} = 0$. This means that via a natural inclusion $M^{\otimes -1}|_F(-\Sigma) \hookrightarrow M^{\otimes -1}|_F$, $\eta|_F \in H^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}(-\Sigma)\right)$. Since $h^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}|_F(-\Sigma)\right) = 0$, $\eta|_F = 0$. It follows that $\eta = 0$. This proves $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. □

Now let X be a smooth projective curve over K and let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Using the above lemmas, we give a sufficient condition in terms of Λ-metric graphs that a line bundle over $\mathscr{X}$ is free at a node $p \in \mathscr{X}_s$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let X and $\mathscr{X}$ be as above. Let $\Gamma := S(\mathscr{X})$ be the associated skeleton. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line bundle over $\mathscr{X}$. Let $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ and denote by Δ_p the corresponding 1-simplex in Γ. Set $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Assume that that $D_{\mathscr{M}} \geq 0$ (cf. (3.11)). Further, assume that, for any connected component Γ' of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$, we have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma'}\right) \geq 1$. Then $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p.*

Proof. To ease notation, we set $M := \mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$. Note that $D_{\mathscr{M}} \geq 0$ means that M is nef. Let $\nu : \widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s} \to \mathscr{X}_s$ is the partial normalization at p. Let F be any connected component of $\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}$. Then by our assumption, $\nu^*(M)|_F$ is nef and $\deg(\nu^*(M)|_F) > 0$. By Lemma 4.2, we have $h^0(\nu^*(M^{\otimes -1})) = 0$. By Lemma 4.1(2), $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p.

Since $H^0(M^{\otimes -1}) \subset H^0(\nu^*(M^{\otimes -1}))$, we have $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. By the Serre duality, $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) = 0$. Thus by the base-change theorem, the natural homomorphism $H^0(\mathscr{L}) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective. Since $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p, this concludes that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. □

In the next lemma, we consider a case where $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is not effective.

Lemma 4.6. *Let X, $\mathscr{X}$, Γ, $\mathscr{L}$, $\mathscr{M}$, p, and Δ_p be as in Lemma 4.5. Set $V := \{v \in V(\mathscr{X}) \mid D_{\mathscr{M}}(v) < 0\}$. Assume that $V \neq \emptyset$ and that there exists a connected component Γ_1 of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$ satisfying $V \subset \Gamma_1$. Further, assume the following.*

(i) *For any connected component Γ' of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$ with $\Gamma' \neq \Gamma_1$, $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma'}) \geq 1$.*
(ii) *There exist $s \geq 1$ and distinct connected components $\Gamma_{11}^\circ, \ldots, \Gamma_{1s}^\circ$ of $\Gamma_1 \setminus V$ such that*
  (a) $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma_{1j}^\circ}\right) \geq 1$ *for any $1 \leq j \leq s$, and*
  (b) *for any $v \in V$, the valence of $\Gamma_{11} \cup \cdots \cup \Gamma_{1s}$ at v is at least $-D_{\mathscr{M}}(v) + 1$, where Γ_{1j} is the closure of Γ_{1j}° in Γ_1.*

Then $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p.

Proof. Let $\nu : \widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s} \to \mathscr{X}_s$ is the partial normalization at p. Via ν we identify $\mathrm{Irr}\left(\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ with $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. For $C \in \mathrm{Irr}\left(\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$, let $[C]$ denote the corresponding point in $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$. To ease notation, we set $M := \mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$.

Claim 4.6.1. *We have $h^0(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}) = 0$.*

Proof. We set $F_1 := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}), [C] \in \Gamma_1} C$, and $F_{1j} := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}), [C] \in \Gamma_{1j}^\circ} C$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$. We take $C_1, \ldots, C_r \in \widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s}$ such that $V = \{[C_1], \ldots, [C_r]\}$. Our assumption says that F_1 is the connected component of $\mathscr{X}_s \setminus \{p\}$ such that $\{C_1, \ldots, C_r\} \subset F_1$. Further, by (ii)(a), each F_{1j} is a connected component of $F_1 - (C_1 + \cdots + C_r)$, $\nu^*(M)|_{F_{1j}}$ is nef, and $\deg\left(\nu^*(M)|_{F_{1j}}\right) > 0$. Lemma 4.2 gives

$$h^0\left(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}\big|_{\sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j}}\right) = 0. \tag{4.13}$$

Take any $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Set $\Sigma_i := C_i \cap (\sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j})$, which we regard as a Cartier divisor on C_i. Then, by the condition (ii)(b), $\deg\left(\nu^*(M)|_{C_i}(\Sigma_i)\right) \geq 1$. Since C_i is irreducible, Lemma 4.2 tells us that

$$h^0\left(\left(\nu^*(M)|_{C_i}(\Sigma_i)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0. \tag{4.14}$$

By (4.13) and (4.14), Lemma 4.4 gives $h^0\left(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}|_{C_i + \sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j}}\right) = 0$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^r C_i + \sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (C_i + \sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j})$, we have $h^0\left(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}|_{\sum_{i=1}^r C_i + \sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j}}\right) = 0$. Since $\nu^*(M)|_{F_1 - (\sum_{i=1}^r C_i + \sum_{j=1}^s F_{1j})}$ is nef, we obtain by Lemma 4.3 that $h^0\left(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}|_{F_1}\right) = 0$.

If F' be any connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$ with $F \neq F'$, then by $\nu^*(M)|_{F'}$ is nef and $\deg(\nu^*(M)|_{F'}) > 0$ by the assumption (i). By Lemma 4.2, we get $h^0\left(\nu^*(M)|_{F'}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. Thus $h^0(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. □

By this claim, we obtain that $h^0\left(\nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, noting that $\nu^*(M)|_{F'}^{\otimes -1} = \nu^*(M)^{\otimes -1}|_{F'}$, and Lemma 4.1 shows that $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p. Then the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 concludes that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. □

4.2. **Fundamental vertical divisors.** Let X be a smooth projective curve over K and let $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Since $\mathscr{X}$ is a local-ringed space, we have the notion of Cartier divisors on $\mathscr{X}$. In this paper, divisors always mean Cartier divisors. Let $\mathrm{Div}(\mathscr{X})$ denote the group of divisors on $\mathscr{X}$.

For any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, let $|\cdot|_C$ denote the absolute value on the function field $K(X)$ that gives the Shilov point associated to C. For any $f \in K(X)^\times$, $\mathrm{ord}_C(f) := -\log|f|_C$ is called the *order of f along C*.

Let $\mathscr{D}$ be a divisor of $\mathscr{X}$. Let g be a local equation of a divisor $\mathscr{D}$ at ξ, i.e., a rational function on $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\mathrm{div}(g) = \mathscr{D}$ on a neighborhood of ξ in $\mathscr{X}$. We define *order of $\mathscr{D}$ along C* to be $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{D}) := -\log|g|_C$. Remark that $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{D})$ does not depend on the choice of g, and that $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{D}) \in \Lambda$ (cf. Remark 2.1).

For a divisor $\mathscr{D}$, its support $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{D})$ is the locus on $\mathscr{X}$ at which the local equation of $\mathscr{D}$ is not a locally invertible regular function. Remark that $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{D})$ is a closed subset of $\mathscr{X}$. A divisor $\mathscr{D}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ is said to be *vertical* if the restriction of $\mathscr{D}$ to X is trivial, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{D}) \subset \mathscr{X}_s$.

Let F be a connected curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$. Assume that F satisfies the following conditions (F):

(F) There exists a $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that for any $p \in F \cap (\mathscr{X}_s - F)$, the multiplicity of $\mathscr{X}$ at p equals λ.

Then we define a vertical divisor $\mathscr{F}$ as follows. For each $p \in F \cap (\mathscr{X}_s - F)$, take a local étale atlas

$$\psi_p : \mathscr{U}_p \to \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi_p))$$

that distinguishes p, where $\varpi_p \in R$ with $v_K(\varpi_p) = \lambda$ (cf. § 2.3). We take ψ_p in such a way that $\psi_p^*(x)$ defines the branch C at p with $C \subset F$. Then there exists a unique divisor $\mathscr{F}$ characterized by the properties that

(i) for any $p \in F \cap (\mathscr{X}_s - F)$, $\mathscr{F}$ has a local equation $\psi_p^*(x)$ on $\mathscr{U}_p$;
(ii) $\mathscr{F} = \mathrm{div}(\varpi_p)$ on some neighborhood of $F \setminus (\mathscr{X}_s - F)$;
(iii) $\mathscr{F}$ is trivial on some neighborhood of $(\mathscr{X}_s - F) \setminus F$.

Remark that $\mathscr{F}$ does not dependent on the choice of the local atlas at p nor of ϖ_p and that $\mathscr{F}$ has support F. We call $\mathscr{F}$ the *fundamental vertical divisor with support F*. The number λ is called the *multiplicity of $\mathscr{F}$*. The fundamental vertical divisor with support F for some connected curve F is simply called a *fundamental vertical divisor*.

Remark 4.7. Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a fundamental vertical divisor on $\mathscr{X}$. Let D be a connected curve with $\mathrm{Irr}(D) \cap \mathrm{Irr}(\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{F})) = \emptyset$. Then $\mathscr{F}|_D$ is a reduced Cartier divisor on D with support $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{F}) \cap D$. This can be checked by using a local equation of $\mathscr{F}$ at each point of $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{F}) \cap D$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K and let $\pi : \mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be a strictly semistable model of X. Let g be a non-zero rational function on $\mathscr{X}$. Let $\mathscr{W} \in \mathrm{Div}(\mathscr{X})$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of fundamental vertical divisors. Assume that there exists an open subset $\mathscr{U}$ of $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \subset \mathscr{U}$ and $(\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W})|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is effective. Then the following holds, where for any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, $[C]$ denotes the Shilov point associated to C.*

(1) *We have $-\log|g([C])| \geq \mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{W})$. Furthermore, if $(\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W})|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is trivial at the generic point of C, then $-\log|g([\xi_C])| = \mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{W})$.*

(2) *Let $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ and let $C_1, C_2 \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ be distinct irreducible components with $p \in C_1 \cap C_2$. Let φ be the affine function on Δ_p with $\varphi([C_i]) = \mathrm{ord}_{C_i}(\mathscr{W})$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $-\log|g(u)| \geq \varphi(u)$ for any $u \in \Delta_p$. Furthermore, if $(\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W})|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is trivial at p, then $-\log|g(u)| = \varphi(u)$.*

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from the definition of ord. Let us prove (2). We take a distinguished local étale morphism $\psi_p : \mathscr{U}_p \to \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi_p))$ such that $\mathscr{U}_p \subset \mathscr{U}$. We may assume that, in the special fiber, C_1 is defined by $\psi_p^*(x)$ and C_2 by $\psi_p^*(y)$. Since $\mathscr{W}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of fundamental vertical divisors, we have a local equation of $\mathscr{W}$ of the form $\varpi\psi_p^*(x)^{m_1}\psi_p^*(y)^{m_2}$ for some $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\varpi \in K^\times$, and then $\varphi = -\log|\varpi\psi_p^*(x)^{m_1}\psi_p^*(y)^{m_2}|$. Put $h_1 := g \cdot \left(\varpi\psi_p^*(x)^{m_1}\psi_p^*(y)^{m_2}\right)^{-1}$. Since $(\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W})|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is effective, h_1 is regular on $\mathscr{U}_p$ and hence $-\log|h_1| \geq 0$ on Δ_p. Thus we obtain $-\log|g| \geq \varphi$. If $(\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W})|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is trivial at p, then h_1 is an invertible regular function around p and hence $-\log|h_1| = 0$. In this case, we have $-\log|g| = \varphi$. □

4.3. **Stepwise vertical divisors.** In this subsection, we define the stepwise vertical divisors associated to an oriented edge of disconnected type and those associated to an edge of connected type. They will be mainly used to construct a tropicalization map that is unimodular over the edge.

Since we use orientations on edges of disconnected type, we fix the notation. Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be an edge of disconnected type. Let λ_e be the length of e. Then there are exactly two isometries from $[0, \lambda_e]$ to e, and an *orientation* means one of the choices of those isometries. Once an orientation on e is given, we usually denote by $\vec{e}$ the edge e with the orientation, and we call this an *oriented edge*. For an oriented edge $\vec{e}$ with orientation $\gamma : [0, \lambda_e] \to e$, we call $\gamma(0)$ the *head of* $\vec{e}$ and call $\gamma(\lambda_e)$ the *tail of* $\vec{e}$.

Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g. Assume that $g \geq 2$ in this subsection. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. As before, let $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ denote the stable model of X. Let e be an edge of Γ_{can}, namely, $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$; see the last paragraph in § 2.5. Let E be the corresponding maximal (-2)-chain in $\mathscr{X}_s$ (cf. Lemma 3.3).

First, we consider the case where e is of disconnected type. Fix an orientation on e, and let $\vec{e}$ denote the oriented edge with this orientation. Let v_0 be the end vertex on e that is the head of $\vec{e}$. Let E_0 be the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $[E_0] = v_0$. Let $E_1, \ldots, E_{r-1}$ be the irreducible components of E, where we put the numbering in such a way that $\#(E_i \cap E_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 0, \ldots, r-2$. Remark that this numbering is unique for $\vec{e}$. Since e is of disconnected type, $\mathscr{X}_s - E$ consists of two connected components; let D be the connected components with $E_0 \subset D$ and let T be the other ones. Let p_i denote the node with $\{p_i\} = E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, r-2$ and let p_{r-1} be the node with $\{p_{r-1}\} = E_{r-1} \cap T$.

Let $E_r \in \mathrm{Irr}(T)$ with $p_{r-1} \in E_r$. See the figure below.



For each $j = 0, \dots, r-1$, the connected curve $\sum_{i=j+1}^{r-1} E_i + T$ satisfies the condition (F) in §4.2, and let $\mathscr{F}_j$ be the fundamental vertical divisor associated to $\sum_{i=j+1}^{r-1} E_i + T$. Further, we set $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}} := \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \mathscr{F}_i$, which we call the *stepwise vertical divisor associated to* $\vec{e}$. For the opposite orientation $\vec{e}^{opp}$, we also have the stepwise vertical divisor $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}^{opp}}$. When we say a *stepwise vertical divisor for* e, we mean $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ or $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}^{opp}}$.

We compute the degree of the stepwise vertical divisor over each $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. By Remark 4.7, we have

$$\deg\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})|_C\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C = E_0 \\ -1 & \text{if } C = E_r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

For multiplicities, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_{E_i}\left(\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda_j, \tag{4.16}$$

where λ_j is the multiplicity at p_j, which also equals the length of the canonical 1-simplex Δ_{p_j} corresponding to p_j (cf. §2.3).

Next, we consider the case where e is of connected type. Here, we assume that E has symmetric multiplicities (cf. Definition 3.1), and let $E_1, \dots, E_{2\ell-1}$ be the irreducible components of E with the numbering such that $\#(E_i \cap E_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2\ell-2$. Let E_0 be the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s - E$ with $E_0 \cap E_1 \neq \emptyset$ and let $E_{2\ell}$ be the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s - E$ with $E_{2\ell} \cap E_{2\ell-1} \neq \emptyset$. Remark that $E_0 = E_{2\ell}$ if and only if e is a loop.

Let p_i denote the node with $p_i \in E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \dots, 2\ell - 1$. See the figure below.



Since E has symmetric multiplicities, the connected curve $\sum_{i=j+1}^{2\ell-1-j} E_i$ satisfies condition (F) in §4.2 for each $j = 0, \dots \ell - 1$, and hence we have the fundamental vertical divisor $\mathscr{F}_j$ with support $\sum_{i=j+1}^{2\ell-1-j} E_i$. Remark that the divisor $\mathscr{F}_i$ does not depend on such numbering of the irreducible components of E, and hence well-defined for e. We set $\mathscr{V}_e := \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \mathscr{F}_i$, which we call the *stepwise vertical divisor associated to* e.

We compute the degree of the stepwise vertical divisor over each $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. If e is a loop, then $E_0 = E_{2\ell}$, and noting Remark 4.7, we obtain

$$\deg\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathscr{V}_e)|_C\right) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } C = E_0, \\ -2 & \text{if } C = E_\ell, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.17}$$

If e is not a loop, then $E_0 \neq E_{2\ell}$, and we have

$$\deg\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathscr{V}_e)|_C\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C = E_0 \text{ or } C = E_{2\ell}, \\ -2 & \text{if } C = E_\ell, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

For multiplicities, we have $\mathrm{ord}_{E_i}(\mathscr{V}_e) = \mathrm{ord}_{E_{2\ell-i}}(\mathscr{V}_e) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda_j$ in any case, where λ_j is the multiplicity at the node p_j, which equals the length of the canonical 1-simplex Δ_{p_j} corresponding to p_j (cf. §2.3).

4.4. **Edge-unimodularity sections and base sections, and unimodular tropicalization.** Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g. From here on to the end of this section, assume that $g \geq 2$. Let L be a line bundle over X. In this subsection, we fix an edge $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2. For a node $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, let Δ_p denote the canonical 1-simplex corresponding to p in $S(\mathscr{X}) = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. Recall that $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} := \{p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \mid \Delta_p \subset e\}$ (cf. (3.9)).

Definition 4.9 (e-base section)**.** A nonzero global section $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ is called an *e-base section* if $\widetilde{s}(p) \neq 0$ for any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$.

We define the notion of edge-unimodularity sections for an edge according to the type of the edge.

Edge of disconnected type. Assume that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is of disconnected type

Definition 4.10 (e-unimodularity section)**.** A nonzero global section $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ is called an *e-unimodularity section* if there exists an orientation on e such that $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ is effective and trivial on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$, where $\vec{e}$ denotes the oriented edge.

The next lemma asserts that e-base section and an e-unimodularity section give a tropicalization map which is unimodular over the edge e.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be an edge of disconnected type. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2. Let $\widetilde{s}_0 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ be an e-base section and let $\widetilde{s}_1 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ be an e-unimodularity section. Set $s_0^{(e)} := \widetilde{s}_0|_X$ and $s_1^{(e)} := \widetilde{s}_1|_X$, which are non-zero global sections of L. We define a function $\varphi^{(e)} : X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi^{(e)} := -\log \left| s_1^{(e)} / s_0^{(e)} \right|$. Let λ_e denote the length of e. Then $\varphi^{(e)}$ gives an isometry $e \to [0, \lambda_e]$.*

Proof. We define the rational function g on $\mathscr{X}$ by $g := \widetilde{s}_1 / \widetilde{s}_0$. Since $\widetilde{s}_1$ is an e unimodularity section, there exists an oriented edge $\vec{e}$ such that $\mathrm{div}\,(\widetilde{s}_1) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ is effective and trivial over some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$. Since $\widetilde{s}_0$ does not have zero on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$, there exists an open neighborhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$ such that $\mathrm{div}\,(g) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is trivial.

We use the notation used in §4.3; in particular, we have $E = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} E_i$, $[E_0]$ is the head of $\vec{e}$, $E_0 \subset D$, $E_r \subset T$ and $\{p_i\} = E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \dots r-1$. For each $i = 0, \dots, r-1$, we take a local étale atlas $\psi_i : \mathscr{U}_i \to \mathrm{Spec}(R[x,y]/(xy - \varpi_i))$ that distinguishes p_i such that $\mathscr{U}_i \subset \mathscr{U}$. Exchanging x and y if necessary, we may assume that in the special fiber $(\mathscr{U}_i)_s$ of $\mathscr{U}_i$, the branch E_{i+1} at p_i is defined by $\psi_i^*(y)$. Since $\mathrm{div}\,(g) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}|_{\mathscr{U}}$ is trivial, g is a local equation of $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ at each p_i. Since we have (4.16), it follows that for any $i = 0, \dots, r-1$, there exists a unit $u_i \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathscr{U}_i)^\times$ such that $g = u_i \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \varpi_j \psi_i^*(y)$ over $\mathscr{U}_i$; indeed, see the properties (i)–(iii) in the definition of fundamental vertical divisor and the definition of $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ in §4.2. Note that $v_K\left(\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \varpi_j\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda_j$. Since $\varphi^{(e)} = -\log |g|_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}|$, $\varphi^{(e)} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda_j - \log |\psi_1^*(y)|_{X^{\mathrm{an}}}|$. It follows from Lemma 4.8(1) that $\varphi^{(e)}$ maps Δ_{p_i} to $\left[\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \lambda_j, \sum_{j=0}^{i} \lambda_j\right]$ isometrically. This shows that $\varphi^{(e)}$ maps $e = \Delta_E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{r-1} \Delta_{p_i}$ to $[0, \lambda_e]$ isometrically. □

Edge of connected type. Assume that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ is of connected type. In this case, we divide e at the middle point of e into two 1-simplices, and let e_1 denote one of them.

Definition 4.12 (e_1-unimodularity section)**.** A nonzero global section $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ is called an *e_1-unimodularity section* if $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{V}_e$ is effective and trivial on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$.

Lemma 4.13. *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be of connected type and let e_1 be as above. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2. Let $\widetilde{s}_0 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ be an e-base section and let $\widetilde{s}_1 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ be an e_1-unimodularity section. Set $s_0^{(e)} := \widetilde{s}_0|_X$ and $s_1^{(e_1)} := \widetilde{s}_1|_X$, which are non-zero global sections of L. We define a function $\varphi^{(e_1)} : X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi^{(e_1)} := -\log \left| s_1^{(e_1)} / s_0^{(e)} \right|$. Let λ_{e_1} denote the length of e_1. Then $\varphi^{(e_1)}$ gives an isometry $e_1 \to [0, \lambda_{e_1}]$.*

Proof. We can prove the lemma in a similar way as in Lemma 4.11, so we omit a proof. □

4.5. **Proof of Proposition 4.14 and unimodular tropicalizations.** In this subsection, we first prove the following Proposition 4.14 to complete the proof of a unimodular tropicalization of the canonical skeleton.

Proposition 4.14. *Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$ over K and let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that* $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$. *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$.*

(1) *Suppose that e is of disconnected type. Fix an orientation on e and let $\vec{e}$ denote the oriented edge. Then there exist a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2, and that there exist an e-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ and an e-unimodularity section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$. More strongly, there exist a section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ such that* $\operatorname{div}\left(\widetilde{s}_1^{(e)}\right) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ *is effective and is trivial on some neighborhood of* $\operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ *(not only on some neighborhood of* $\operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$*).*

(2) *Suppose that e is of connected type. Let e_1 be a half of e, that is, a 1-simplex that appears by subdividing e at the middle point. Then there exist a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2, and that there exist an e-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ and an e_1-unimodularity section $\widetilde{s}^{(e_1)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$.*

To prove Proposition 4.14, we first show the following lemma based on Proposition 3.13.

Lemma 4.15. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 2$ and let L be a line bundle over X. Take an edge $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. Let v be an end vertex of e. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2 and such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$ on Γ_{can} satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 3.13, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Then the following holds.*

(1) *The line bundle $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $q \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.*

(2) *Suppose that e is of disconnected type. Put the orientation on e with origin v and let $\vec{e}$ denote the oriented edge. Then $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})$ is free at any $q \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.*

(3) *Suppose that e is of connected type. Divide e into two 1-simplices at the middle point of e, and let e_1 be one of them that contains v. Then $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$ is free at any $q \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$.*

Proof. (1) We take any $q \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. To show the freeness of $\mathscr{L}$ at q, we use Lemma 4.5. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$, we have $D_{\mathscr{M}} \geq 0$. Since Δ_q is a part of the bridge e, any connected component Γ' of $\Gamma \setminus \operatorname{relin}(\Delta_q)$ contains an island Γ_i of Γ, and Proposition 3.13(i) shows that $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma'}) \geq 1$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at q.

(2) One can similarly show the freeness of $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})$ at q as in (1). Indeed, let v' the end vertex of e with $v \neq v'$. By (4.15), we have $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})} = D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] + [v']$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$, we have $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})} \geq 0$. As in the proof of (1), any connected component Γ' of $\Gamma \setminus \operatorname{relin}(\Delta_q)$ contains an island Γ_i of Γ, and Proposition 3.13(i) shows that $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})}\big|_{\Gamma'}) \geq 1$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})$ is free at q.

(3) If e is not a loop, then let v' be the end vertex of e other than v; if e is a loop, then set $v = v'$. Let w denote the middle point of e. By (4.17) and (4.18), we have $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)} = D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] - [v'] + 2[w]$. We take any $q \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}(v') \geq 0$. Then, since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$, we have $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)} \geq 0$. Since Δ_q is a part of the bridge e of connected type, $\Gamma \setminus \operatorname{relin}(\Delta_q)$ is connected, and Proposition 3.13(i) shows that $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}\big|_{\Gamma \setminus \operatorname{relin}(\Delta_q)}) \geq 1$. It follows from Lemma 4.5 that $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$ is free at q.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}(v') < 0$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$, this means that $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}(v') = -1$. We use Lemma 4.6. In this case, we let $V := \{v'\}$ and $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma \setminus \operatorname{relin}(\Delta_q)$. Since $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$

satisfies the condition (ii) in Proposition 3.13, we have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v]|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \leq 1$. It follows that

$$\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v]|_{\Gamma\setminus\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) = \deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v]\right) - \deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v]|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \geq g - 1 \geq 1.$$

Since $D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}(v') = -1$, we have $(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v])(v') = -1$. Further, we have $v' \in \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$. It follows form the above inequality that there exists $u \in \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ such that $u \neq v'$ and $(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v])(u) \geq 1$.

Let Γ_{11}° be the connected component of $\Gamma_1 \setminus \{v'\}$ that contains w, and let Γ_{12}° be the connected component of $\Gamma_1 \setminus \{v'\}$ that contains u. Note that $\Gamma_{11}^{\circ} \neq \Gamma_{12}^{\circ}$. Indeed, since $\Delta_q \subset e_1$, we have $\Gamma_{11}^{\circ} \subset \mathrm{relin}(e)$; on the other hand, since $u \notin \mathrm{relin}(e)$, $\Gamma_{12}^{\circ} \not\subset \mathrm{relin}(e)$. We have

$$\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}\big|_{\Gamma_{11}^{\circ}}\right) \geq \deg(2[w]) = 2 \geq 1, \quad \deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}\big|_{\Gamma_{12}^{\circ}}\right) \geq \deg(u) = 1.$$

Further, if we set $\Gamma_{1j} := \Gamma_{1j}^{\circ} \cup \{v'\}$ for $j = 1, 2$, then the valence of $\Gamma_{11} \cup \Gamma_{12}$ at v' is at least $2 = -D_{\mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)}(v') + 1$. Thus we conclude by Lemma 4.6 that $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$ is free at q. □

Proof of Proposition 4.14. We construct a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$. We take an end-vertex v of e as follows: if e is of disconnected type, we take v to be the head of $\vec{e}$; if e is of connected type, we take v such that $v \in e_1$ (for (2)). We apply Proposition 3.13, where we take v as x. Then we get a strictly semistable model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v] \geq 0$ on Γ_{can} satisfying the conditions (i)(ii) in Proposition 3.13, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. By Lemma 4.15(1), $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, which implies that there exists a global section of $\widetilde{s}_0 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ that does not vanish at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. In particular, this show the existence of an e-base section for e.

Suppose that e is of disconnected type and we show (1). By Lemma 4.15(2), $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}})$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, which implies that there exists a global section of $\widetilde{s}_{1,-}^{(e)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}))$ that does not vanish at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Let $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e)}$ be the image of $\widetilde{s}_{1,-}^{(e)}$ by the natural inclusion $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{L}$. Then $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e)}$ satisfies the required condition. This completes the proof of (1).

Suppose that e is of connected type and we show (2). The same argument as above which uses Lemma 4.15(3) instead of Lemma 4.15(2) shows the existence of an e_1-unimodularity section. □

Now, we are ready to construct a unimodular tropicalization of the canonical skeleton Γ_{can}. In fact, we construct a tropicalization map that is not only unimodular but also separate two points which are in some special positions. To do this we prove one more lemma.

Lemma 4.16. *Let e be an edge of disconnected type. Put an orientation on e and let $\vec{e}$ denote the oriented edge. Let Γ_1 be the connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ containing the head of $\vec{e}$, and let Γ_2 be the other connected component. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a strictly semistable model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model in Definition 3.2. Let $\widetilde{s}_0$ and $\widetilde{s}_1$ be global sections of $\mathscr{L}$ such that*

(i) *$\widetilde{s}_0(p) \neq 0$ for any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$;*
(ii) *$\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}_1) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ is effective and trivial on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.*

Let g denote the rational function that is the restriction to X of the rational function $\widetilde{s}_1/\widetilde{s}_0$ on $\mathscr{X}$. Set $\varphi := -\log|g|$. Let λ_e denote the length of e. Then $\varphi(\Gamma_1) = \{0\}$ and $\varphi(\Gamma_2) = \{\lambda_e\}$.

Proof. By the definition of g, there exists an open neighborhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ such that $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ is trivial over $\mathscr{U}$.

First, we take any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset\Gamma_1}$. Let C_1 and C_2 be the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $q \in C_1 \cap C_2$. By the definition of $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_{C_i}(\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 4.8, it follows that $\varphi(\Delta_q) = 0$. Since $\Gamma_1 = \bigcup_{q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset\Gamma_1}} \Delta_q$, this proves $\varphi(\Gamma_1) = \{0\}$.

Next, we take any $q' \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset\Gamma_2}$. Let C_1' and C_2' be the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $q' \in C_1' \cap C_2'$. By the definition of $\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_{C_i'}(\mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}) = \lambda_e$ for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 4.8, it follows that $\varphi(\Delta_q) = \lambda_e$. Since $\Gamma_2 = \bigcup_{q' \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset\Gamma_2}} \Delta_{q'}$, this proves $\varphi(\Gamma_2) = \{\lambda_e\}$. □

Theorem 4.17. *Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$ over K, and let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that $\deg(L) \geq 3g - 1$. Then there exist non-zero sections $s_0, \ldots, s_N \in H^0(L)$ such that the map $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ defined by*

$$\varphi := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$$

gives a unimodular tropicalization of the canonical skeleton Γ_{can}. Furthermore, we can take $s_0, \ldots, s_N$ in such a way that φ has the following properties.

(i) *Suppose that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{st})$ is of disconnected type. Then $\varphi|_e$ is an isometry.*
(ii) *Suppose that $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{st})$ is of connected type. Let ι be the canonical involution of e, and e^ι be the set of ι-fixed points. Let e' and e'' be the closures of the connected components of $e \setminus e^\iota$ respectively. Then $\varphi|_{e'}$ is an isometry, and $\varphi|_{e''}$ is an isometry.*
(iii) *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{st})$ be of disconnected type. Let $x, y \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ be points such that x and y do not belong to the same connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$. Then $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(y)$ and $\varphi(x), \varphi(y) \notin \mathrm{relin}(e)$.*

Proof. We write $E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) = \{e_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1} \amalg \{e_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m_1+m_2}$, where e_i $(1 \leq i \leq m_1)$ is an edge of disconnected type, and e_i $(m_1 + 1 \leq i \leq m_1 + m_2)$ is an edge of connected type.

For $1 \leq i \leq m_1$, we give an orientation to e and let $\vec{e}$ denote the oriented edge. Then Proposition 4.14(1) gives a model $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{L}_i)$ of (X, L) such that e_i-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e_i)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ and a section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ such that $\mathrm{div}\left(\widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i)}\right) - \mathscr{V}_{\vec{e}}$ is effective and trivial on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. In particular, $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i)}$ is an e_i-unimodularity section.

For $m_1 + 1 \leq i \leq m_1 + m_2$, we divide e_i into two 1-simplices at the middle point and let e_{i1} and e_{i2} be the 1-simplices arising from this subdivision. For $j = 1, 2$, Proposition 4.14(2) gives a model $(\mathscr{X}_{ij}, \mathscr{L}_{ij})$ of (X, L) and an e_i-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e_i)} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ and an e_{ij}-unimodularity section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e_{ij})} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$.

We consider $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e_i)}\Big|_X, \widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i)}\Big|_X \in H^0(L)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m_1$, and $\widetilde{s}_0^{(e_i)}\Big|_X, \widetilde{s}_1^{(e_{i1})}\Big|_X, \widetilde{s}_1^{(e_{i2})}\Big|_X \in H^0(L)$ for $m_1 + 1 \leq i \leq m_1 + m_2$. We denote them by $s_1, \ldots, s_{2m_1+3m_2}$. Set $N := 2m_1 + 3m_2$. Further, since L is basepoint free, we take a global section $s_0 \in H^0(L)$ such that $s_0, \ldots, s_N$ generate L at any point of X. Then it is straightforward from Lemmas 4.11 and 4.13 that the map φ determined by $s_0, \ldots, s_N$ give a unimodular tropicalization of Γ_{can} satisfying the properties (i) and (ii).

Furthermore, this tropicalization also satisfies (iii). Indeed, since x and y do not belong to the same island, there exists a bridge $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ such that there exists an connected component Γ_1 of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ such that $x \in \Gamma_1$, and the other connected component Γ_2 contains y. For this e with an orientation, since there exists a global section that satisfies (i) of Lemma 4.16 among $\widetilde{s}_0^{e_i}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m_1)$ and there exists one that satisfies (ii) of Lemma 4.16 among $\widetilde{s}_1^{e_i}$ $(1 \leq i \leq m_1)$, we see from Lemma 4.16 that condition (iii) of the theorem is satisfied. □

5. Faithful tropicalization for canonical skeleta

Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus g and let L be a line bundle over X. In this section, assume that $g \geq 2$. Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ be the canonical skeleton of X^{an}. If $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$, then we have already constructed enough global sections of L which give a unimodular tropicalization of Γ. However, we have not yet obtained a faithful tropicalization. In view of Theorem 4.17(i)(ii)(iii), we still need to construct global sections of L that separate distinct points x, y of the canonical skeleton like below, where $\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}$ is the stable model of X over R:

(i) $x, y \in \mathrm{relin}(e)$ for some $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ of connected type, and x and y belong to different connected components of $\mathrm{relin}(e) \setminus \{v_1\}$, where v_1 is the middle point of e;
(ii) $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e)$ and $y \in f$ for some distinct $e, f \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$;
(iii) $x, y \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$.

We will construct global sections which take care of (i) in § 5.1, (ii) in § 5.2, and (iii) in § 5.3.

5.1. Separating sections for an edge of connected type.

In this subsection, we construct global sections which will be used to separate points in an edge of connected type.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be of connected type. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a good model of X. Then there exist exactly two fundamental vertical divisors $\mathscr{A}_1$ and $\mathscr{A}_2$ on $\mathscr{X}$ such that $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A}_1)}$ and $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A}_2)}$ are the two 1-simplices in e that arise by dividing e at the middle points.*

Proof. Let E be the chain of (-2)-curves in $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $\Delta_E = e$ (cf. Lemma 3.3). Since $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model, $\#\operatorname{Irr}(E)$ is odd and not less than 3, say, $\#\operatorname{Irr}(E) = 2\ell - 1 \geq 3$. Let $E_1, \dots, E_{2\ell-1}$ denote the irreducible components of E with the numbering such that $\#(E_i \cap E_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2\ell-2$; see the second figure in § 4.3. Let E_0 and $E_{2\ell}$ denote the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s - E$ with $E_0 \cap E_1 \neq \emptyset$ with $E_{2\ell-1} \cap E_{2\ell} \neq \emptyset$, respectively. For each $i = 0, \dots, 2\ell-1$, let p_i denote the node with $\{p_i\} = E_i \cap E_{i+1}$ and let λ_i denote the multiplicity of $\mathscr{X}$ at p_i. Since $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model, we have $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\ell-1} = \lambda_\ell = \lambda_{2\ell-1}$. It follows that there exist fundamental vertical divisors $\mathscr{A}_1$ whose support equals $E_1 + \cdots + E_{\ell-1}$ and $\mathscr{A}_2$ whose support equals $E_{\ell+1} + \cdots + E_{2\ell-1}$, and actually, $\mathscr{A}_1$ and $\mathscr{A}_2$ are the required ones. It is obvious that there are no other fundamental vertical divisors with the required properties. □

Definition 5.2 (separating divisor for an edge of connected type)**.** Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be of connected type. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a good model of X. A fundamental divisor $\mathscr{A}$ is called a *separating divisor for e* if it equals $\mathscr{A}_1$ or $\mathscr{A}_2$ as in Lemma 5.1.

Definition 5.3 (separating section for an edge of connected type)**.** Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be of connected type. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good. Let $\widetilde{s}$ be a nonzero global section of $\mathscr{L}$. We call $\widetilde{s}$ a *separating section for e* if there exists a separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ for e such that $\operatorname{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{A}$ is effective and is trivial on some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})$.

Let e_1 and e_2 be the 1-simplices that arise by dividing e at the middle point. Remark that there exists a unique separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ with $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})} = e_2$. In this case, $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A}) = \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})_{\subset e_1}$.

The following lemma shows that if e is an edge of connected type, then an e-base section (cf. Definition 4.9) and a separating section for e will be useful to separate points in $\mathrm{relin}(e)$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be of connected type. Let $\widetilde{s}_0^e$ be an e-base section and let $\widetilde{s}_1^e$ be a separating section for e. We set $s_0^e := \widetilde{s}_0^e|_X$ and $s_1^e := \widetilde{s}_1^e|_X$, and we set $f := s_1^e / s_0^e$,*

which is a nonzero rational function on X. Let e_1 and e_2 be the two 1-simplices that arise by subdividing e at the middle point. Then, for any $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e_1)$ and $y \in \mathrm{relin}(e_2)$, we have $-\log|f(x)| \neq -\log|f(y)|$.

Proof. Since $\widetilde{s}_1^e$ is a separating section for e, there exists a separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ for e as in Definition 5.3. Note that $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})}$ equals e_1 or e_2. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})} = e_2$. We set $g := \widetilde{s}_1^e/\widetilde{s}_0^e$. This is a rational function and is regular over some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$. Furthermore, $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{A}$ is effective over that neighborhood.

Set $\varphi := -\log|f|$. Remark that f is the restriction of g to the generic fiber. Then by Lemma 4.8 (1), we have $\varphi(x) > 0$ for $x \in V(\mathscr{X}) \cap \mathrm{relin}(e_2)$. By Lemma 4.8 (2), it follows that $\varphi(x) > 0$ for $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e_2)$. On the other hand, since $\widetilde{s}_1^e$ does not vanish at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$, Lemma 4.8 gives us $\varphi(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in e_1$. This proves the lemma. □

Therefore, for any edge e of connected type, we want to construct a model of (X, L) that has an e-base section and a separating section for e. In fact, we prove the following.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose that $\deg(L) \geq 3g - 1$. Then for any $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ of connected type, there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good such that there exist an e-base section and a separating section for e of $\mathscr{L}$.*

Proof. Fix an $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ of connected type. Let v_1 be the middle point of e. Applying Proposition 3.13 for $x = v_1$, we obtain a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:

(i) $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model of X in Definition 3.2,
(ii) $\mathscr{M}$ is vertically nef, $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_1) \geq 1$, and $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}) \leq 2$; see (3.11) for $D_{\mathscr{M}}$.

Remark that $\deg\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) \geq g + 1$.

We prove that there exists an e-base section of $\mathscr{L}$. Take any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$ and put $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_p)$. Since p is of connected type, $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is connected. By condition (ii) above, $D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}}$ is effective and has positive degree. By Lemma 4.5, it follows that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p, which shows the existence of an e-base section.

It remains to show that $\mathscr{L}$ has a separating section for e. Let e_1 and e_2 be the 1-simplices arising by dividing e at v_1. Since $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model, Lemma 5.1 gives a separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ for e with $\Delta_{\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})} = e_2$. Remark that $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A}) = \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$.

Set $\mathscr{L}_1 := \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{A})$. We show that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$ by using Lemma 4.5 ane Lemma 4.6. Take any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e_1}$ and set $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_q)$. Since q is of connected type, $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is connected. Set $\mathscr{M}_1 := \mathscr{L}_1 \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1} = \mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{A})$. To calculate $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$, let E be the maximal (-2)-chain with $\Delta_E = e$ (cf. Lemma 3.3); let $E_1, \ldots, E_{2\ell-1}$ be the irreducible components of E, where the numbering is given in such a way that $\#(E_i \cap E_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots 2\ell - 2$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A}) = E_{\ell+1} + \cdots + E_{2\ell-1}$; let C_0 be the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $E_{2\ell-1} \cap C_0 \neq \emptyset$, and put $v_0 = [C_0]$; further, put $w_i := [E_i]$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 2\ell - 1$. Then

$$D_{\mathscr{M}_1} = (D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]) - [v_0] + [w_{\ell+1}] + [w_{2\ell-1}],$$

and $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\Gamma \setminus \{v_0\}}$ is effective, where we remark that $v_1 = w_\ell$ is the middle point of e.

If $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0) \geq 0$, then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$ is effective and has positive degree, and hence $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q by Lemma 4.5.

We suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0) < 0$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0) = -1$, and $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(x) \geq -1$ for any $x \in \Gamma$. Thus $\{v \in \widetilde{\Gamma} \mid D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v) \leq -1\} = \{v_0\}$. Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1$ be the connected component of $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{v_0\}$ such that $w_{2\ell-1} \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_1$. Then $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_1}\right) \geq D_{\mathscr{M}_1}([w_{2\ell-1}]) \geq 1$. Since $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1 \subset e \setminus \{v_0\}$

and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \leq 2$, it follows that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_1}\right) \leq 3$. Since $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}) \geq 3$ and $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0) = -1$, this means that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{(\widetilde{\Gamma}\setminus\{v_0\})\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}_1}\right) \geq 1$. It follows that there exists a connected component $\widetilde{\Gamma}_2$ of $\widetilde{\Gamma}\setminus\{v_0\}$ such that $\widetilde{\Gamma}_2 \neq \widetilde{\Gamma}_1$ and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_2}\right) \geq 1$. Since the valence of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1 \cup \widetilde{\Gamma}_2 \cup \{v_0\}$ at v_0 is at least $2 = -D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0)+1$, Lemma 4.6, therefore, concludes that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q.

Since $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q, there exists a global section s_1 of $\mathscr{L}_1 = \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{A})$ such that $s_1(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e} \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})$. Let s be the image of s_1 by the natural homomorphism $\mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{A}) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{L}$. Then it is straightforward to see that s is a separating section for e. □

5.2. **Edges-separating sections.** We keep the setting that $\Gamma := \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. Let e be an edge of Γ, that is, $e \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. Further, let f be another edge of Γ. We want to separate a point in $\mathrm{relin}(e)$ and a point in f.

Note that if e is of disconnected type, we have actually done this separation. Indeed, let φ be the tropicalization map as in Theorem 4.17. If e is of disconnected type, then f is contained in a connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$. By condition (iii) in Theorem 4.17, we obtain $\varphi(f) \cap \varphi(\mathrm{relin}(e)) = \emptyset$, and thus φ separates a point in $\mathrm{relin}(e)$ and a point in f.

Therefore, we consider the case where e is of connected type. In this subsection, let $(e, f) \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \times E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. Further, assume that e is of connected type and that $f \neq e$.

5.2.1. *Edges-separating sections.* Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a good model of X and let E be the maximal (-2)-chain corresponding to e (cf. Lemma 3.3). Then since E has symmetric multiplicities, there exists a unique fundamental vertical divisor $\mathscr{F}_e$ with support E (cf. § 4.2).

Definition 5.6 (edges-separating sections)**.** Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model. A nonzero global section $\widetilde{s}$ of $\mathscr{L}$ is called an (e, f)-*separating section* if $\mathrm{div}\,(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{F}_e$ is effective and is trivial at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$.

The following lemma shows the merit of edges-separating sections.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good. Let $\widetilde{s}_0$ be an e-base section and let $\widetilde{s}_1$ be an (e, f)-separating section of $\mathscr{L}$. Set $g := \widetilde{s}_1/\widetilde{s}_0|_X$, which is a nonzero rational function on X. Further, set $\varphi := -\log|g|$. Then for any $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e)$ and any $y \in f$, we have $\varphi(x) > 0$ and $\varphi(y) \leq 0$, and in particular, $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(y)$.*

Proof. This lemma is shown by the same argument as the proof of Lemma 5.4. □

In this subsection, we aim to take an e-base section and an (e, f)-separating section for a suitable model of (X, L). Our goal is the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Assume that $\deg(L) \geq 3g - 1$. Let e and f be distinct edges of Γ_{can} with e of connected type. Then there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good such that $\mathscr{L}$ has an e-base section and an (e, f)-separating section.*

To show Proposition 5.8, we use the following proposition.

Proposition 5.9. *Let e and f be as above. Then there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties.*

(i) *The model $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model.*
(ii) *For any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$, $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p.*
(iii) *Let $\mathscr{V}_e$ be the stepwise vertical divisor for e. Set $\mathscr{L}_1 := \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$. Then for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$, $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q.*

Indeed, Proposition 5.8 is deduced from Proposition 5.9 as follows. Take a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ as in Proposition 5.9. Then since $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$, there exists a global section $\widetilde{s}_0$ of $\mathscr{L}$ such that $\widetilde{s}_0(p) \neq 0$ for any such p. Thus we have an e-base section. Since $\mathscr{L}_1 = \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$ is free at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$, there exists a global section $\widetilde{s}_1$ of $\mathscr{L}_1$ such that $\widetilde{s}_1(q) \neq 0$ for any such q. Let $\widetilde{s}$ be the image of $\widetilde{s}_1$ by the canonical injection $\mathscr{L}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathscr{L}$. Then it is obvious that $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{V}_e$ is effective and is trivial at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$. Since $\mathscr{V}_e - \mathscr{F}_e$ is effective and is trivial at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$, it follows that $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{F}_e$ is effective and is trivial at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$. Thus $\widetilde{s}$ is an (e, f)-separating section, and Proposition 5.8 is deduced.

Now, the goal is to show Proposition 5.9. We will prove it according to the position of e and f in Γ. The construction of a model will be done separately according to the following two cases:

(A) f is of disconnected type, or f is of connected type and $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$ is connected;
(B) f is of connected type and $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$ is not connected.

For case (A), we may take the same kind of models obtained by Proposition 3.13 as before, but for case (B), we need to construct another kind of model. The construction will be done below.

Remark 5.10. This is a remark for condition (ii) in Proposition 5.9. With the notation in this proposition, set $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ (see (3.11) for the definition) is effective and has positive degree. Then for any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$, $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p; indeed, since e is of connected type, $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is connected, and hence the conclusion follows from Lemma 4.5. Therefore, as far as $\mathscr{M}$ is nef and has positive degree, condition (ii) always holds.

5.2.2. *Model for the case (B).* To take case of Case (B) in the proof of Proposition 5.9, we construct a suitable model. Remark that under the situation of (B), e nor f is a loop. Further, remark that $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$ has exactly two connected components, because e and f are of connected type.

Recall that X is a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 2$ and L is a line bundle over X.

Proposition 5.11. *Assume that we are under the situation of Case (B), that is, e and f are edges of connected type such that $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$ is not connected, where $\Gamma := \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be the connected components of $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$. Suppose that $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$. Then there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is good and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma_i}\right) \geq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$.*

To construct a model as in Proposition 5.11, we will apply Proposition 3.12 together with the following lemma.

Lemma 5.12. *We keep the notation of Proposition 5.11. Let $D \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ be a divisor with $\deg(D) \geq g+1$. Then there exists an effective divisor $E \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ such that $E \sim D$ and $\deg(E|_{\Gamma_i}) \geq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. First, we assume that $\deg(D) \geq g(\Gamma)+2$. Let w_1 and w_2 be the end vertices of f. Then using Proposition 3.5, we obtain an effective divisor E such that $E + [w_1] + [w_2] \sim D$. Thus we are done.

In the remaining of the proof, we assume that $\deg(D) \leq g(\Gamma)+1$. Since we have $\deg(D) \geq g+1$ by the assumption of the lemma and since $g \geq g(\Gamma)$, it follows that $\deg(D) = g(\Gamma)+1 = g+1$. In particular, $g(\Gamma) = g$.

Note that $g(\Gamma_i) \geq 1$ for any $i = 1, 2$. To see that by contradiction, assume that $g(\Gamma_i) = 0$ for some i. If Γ_i is a singleton or a chain, then the valence of Γ at w_i (and at v_i) should be 2, but that is impossible by Remark 3.11. Thus Γ_i is a tree with at least three vertices at which Γ_i has valence 1. Take a valence 1 point u of Γ_i with $u \neq v_i$ and $u \neq w_i$. Then u is a point at which Γ also has valence 1. However, that is impossible by Remark 3.11. Thus $g(\Gamma_i) \geq 1$.

Let w_3 be the middle point of f. By Proposition 3.4, we take the w_3-reduced divisor $D_{w_3} \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ with $D_{w_3} \sim D$. Since $\deg(D) = g(\Gamma) + 1$, D_{w_3} is effective and $D_{w_3}(w_3) \geq 1$ (cf. Remark 3.6).

Claim 5.12.1. *If* $\mathrm{Supp}(D_{w_3}) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$ *for some* $i = 1, 2$*, then* $D_{w_3}(w_3) \geq 2$*.*

Proof. By symmetry on $i = 1, 2$, we may and do assume that $\mathrm{Supp}(D_{w_3}) \cap \Gamma_2 = \emptyset$. Let Γ' be the topological space obtained from Γ by contracting Γ_2 to a singleton, and let $\alpha : \Gamma \to \Gamma'$ be the natural surjective map. Remark that $\{\alpha(w_2)\} = \alpha(\Gamma_2)$. Via α, we endow Γ' with a Λ-metric graph structure. Remark that $\alpha|_{\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_2}$ is an isometry from $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_2$ to $\Gamma' \setminus \{\alpha(w_2)\}$.

Let D'_{w_3} be the pushout of D_{w_3} by α; in this situation, since $\mathrm{Supp}(D_{w_3}) \cap \Gamma_2 = \emptyset$, it is the divisor supported on $\Gamma' \setminus \{\alpha(w_2)\}$ that coincides with D_{w_3} via the isometry $\alpha|_{\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_2}$. We prove that D'_{w_3} is an $\alpha(w_3)$-reduced divisor. To argue it by contradiction, suppose that D'_{w_3} is not an $\alpha(w_3)$-reduced divisor. Then there exists a connected compact subset A of $\Gamma' \setminus \alpha(w_3)$ such that any point in ∂A is saturated for D'_{w_3}. The set $\alpha^{-1}(A)$ is a connected compact subset of $\Gamma \setminus \{w_3\}$. Since $D'_{w_3}(\alpha(w_2)) = 0$, $\alpha(w_2) \notin \partial A$. It follows that α is a homeomorphism over ∂A, and hence $\alpha^{-1}(\partial A) = \partial \alpha^{-1}(A)$. Since α is a homeomorphism over ∂A and over $\mathrm{Supp}(D'_{w_3})$, it follows that any point in $\partial \alpha^{-1}(A)$ is saturated for D_{w_3}. However, that contradicts that this is w_3-reduced. This shows that D'_{w_3} is $\alpha(w_3)$-reduced.

Since $g(\Gamma_2) \geq 1$, $g(\Gamma') = g(\Gamma) - g(\Gamma_2) \leq g(\Gamma) - 1$, and hence $\deg(D'_{w_3}) \geq g(\Gamma') + 2$. By Remark 3.6, it follows that $D'_{w_3}(\alpha(w_3)) \geq 2$. Thus $D_{w_3}(w_3) \geq 2$, as required. □

Let us prove the lemma. Since $D_{w_3} \in |D|$, if $\mathrm{Supp}(D_{w_3}) \cap \Gamma_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$, then we are done. Suppose that $\mathrm{Supp}(D_{w_3}) \cap \Gamma_i = \emptyset$ for some $i = 1, 2$. Then by Claim 5.12.1, $D_{w_3}(w_3) \geq 2$. Set $E := D_{w_3} - 2[w_3]$, which is thus effective. Since w_3 is the middle point of f, $2[w_3] \sim [w_1] + [w_2]$, and hence $D \sim D_{w_3} \sim E + [w_1] + [w_2]$. We have $\mathrm{Supp}(E + [w_1] + [w_2]) \cap \Gamma_1 \neq \emptyset$ for any $i = 1, 2$, this shows the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 5.11. Take a divisor $\tilde{D}$ on X such that $L \otimes \omega_X^{\otimes -1} \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D})$. Let $\tau : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ be the retraction map. Then $\deg\left(\tau_*(\tilde{D})\right) \geq g+1$, and hence by Lemma 5.12, there exists an $D \in \left|\tau_*(\tilde{D})\right|$ such that $\deg\left(D|_{\Gamma_1}\right) \geq 1$ and $\deg\left(D|_{\Gamma_2}\right) \geq 1$. By Proposition 3.12, there exist a good model $\mathscr{X}$ of X and a line bundle $\mathscr{M}$ over $\mathscr{X}$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} = D$. Set $\mathscr{L} := \mathscr{M} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}$. Then by construction, $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ is a model that has the required properties in Proposition 5.11. □

5.2.3. *Proof of Proposition 5.9.* We fix the following notation. Let v_0 and v'_0 denote the end vertices of e; remark that $v_0 = v'_0$ when e is a loop. Let v_1 be the middle point of e; when e is a loop, v_1 is the point antipodal to v_0. Fix an arbitrary $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset f}$. Set $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_q)$. Note that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is connected if and only if f is of connected type. If $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is not connected, it has exactly two connected components, each of which contains some island of the canonical weighted skeleton $\bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$.

Our argument goes according to the cases (A) or (B) above.

Case (A). Applying Proposition 3.13, we obtain a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ with the following properties, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:

(i) $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model;
(ii) $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_0]$ is effective;
(iii) $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_0]$ has positive degree over any connected component of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$.

Since $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is effective and has positive degree, $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)_{\subset e}$ (cf. Remark 5.10). Thus it remains to show that $\mathscr{L}_1 = \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$ is free at q. Set $\mathscr{M}_1 := \mathscr{L}_1 \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1} = \mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$. Then

$$D_{\mathscr{M}_1} = (D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_0]) - [v_0'] + 2[v_1].$$

Remark that $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$ is effective over $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{v_0'\}$.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0') \geq 0$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$ is effective, and by condition (iii) above, $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$ has positive degree on any connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_q)$. Thus Lemma 4.5 concludes that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0') \leq -1$. To show that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q, we are going to use Lemma 4.6. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_0]$ is effective, we then have $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0') = -1$ and $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(x) \geq 0$ for any other $x \in \Gamma$. If $\widetilde{\Gamma}'$ is a connected component of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ with $v_0' \notin \widetilde{\Gamma}'$, then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'}$ has positive degree by condition (iii) above.

Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$ be the connected component of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ with $v_0' \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$. Since v_0 and v_0' are the end vertices of e (possibly $v_0 = v_0'$), $\mathrm{relin}(e) \subset \widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$. Further, let $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1'$ be the connected component of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0' \setminus \{v_0'\}$ containing $\mathrm{relin}(e)$. Since $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \geq D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_1) \geq 2$, we have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_1'}\right) \geq 2$.

Claim 5.12.2. *Under the setting of (A), the valence of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1' \cup \{v_0'\}$ at v_0' is at least 2.*

Proof. First, suppose that f is of disconnected type. Then, since e is of connected type, $\Gamma_0' \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is connected. Since Γ_1' is the connected component of Γ_0' containing $\mathrm{relin}(e)$, it follows that the valence of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1' \cup \{v_0'\}$ at v_0' cannot be 1, and thus it is at least 2.

Next, suppose that f is of connected type. By assumption, $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is connected. It follows that the valence of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1' \cup \{v_0'\}$ at v_0' cannot be 1, and hence it is at least 2. □

By this claim, Lemma 4.6 concludes that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q in this case.

Case (B). In this case, since e is not a loop, $v_0 \neq v_0'$. By the assumption, $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ is not connected. Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$ be the connected components of $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e)$ with $v_0 \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_0$ and $v_0' \in \widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$, respectively. Remark that one of the connected components of $\Gamma \setminus (\mathrm{relin}(e) \cup \mathrm{relin}(f))$ is contained in $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0$, and the other is contained in $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0'$. By Proposition 5.11, there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties, where we put $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:

(i) $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model;
(ii) $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is effective, and $D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_0}$ and $D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_0'}$ have positive degree.

Since $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is effective and has positive degree, it remains to show that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q (cf. Remark 5.10). Set $\mathscr{M}_1 := \mathscr{L}_1 \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1} = \mathscr{M}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1} = D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_0] - [v_0'] + 2[v_1]$. Remark that

$$V_1 := \{v \in V(\mathscr{X}) \mid D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v) \leq -1\} \subseteq \{v_0, v_0'\}.$$

If $V_1 = \emptyset$, then $D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}}$ is effective and has positive degree, and hence Lemma 4.5 concludes that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q.

We suppose that $V_1 \neq \emptyset$. First, suppose moreover that $V_1 = \{v_0'\}$ or $V_1 = \{v_0\}$. By symmetry, we may and do assume that $V_1 = \{v_0'\}$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0') = -1$. Further, $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus V_1$ has

two connected components $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1 := \widetilde{\Gamma}_0 \cup \mathrm{relin}(e)$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1 := \widetilde{\Gamma}'_0 \setminus \{v'_0\}$. We have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_1}\right) \geq \deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \geq 1$.

We now prove that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1}\right) \geq 1$. By the choice of the model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$, $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0}\right) \geq 1$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v'_0) = -1$, we have $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v'_0) = 0$. It follows that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1}\right) \geq 1$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}$ coincides with $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ on $\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1$, we indeed have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1}\right) \geq 1$.

Furthermore, since $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is connected and since $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma}'_1$ are the distinct connected components of $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus \{v'_0\}$, the valence of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_1 \cup \widetilde{\Gamma}'_1 \cup \{v'_0\} = \widetilde{\Gamma}$ at v'_0 is at least 2. By Lemma 4.6, this concludes that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q.

Finally, we consider the case where $V_1 = \{v_0, v'_0\}$. In this case, $\widetilde{\Gamma} \setminus V_1$ has three connected components $\widetilde{\Gamma}_0 \setminus \{v_0\}$, $\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0 \setminus \{v'_0\}$, and $\mathrm{relin}(e)$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_0) = D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v'_0) = -1$, we have $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_0) = D_{\mathscr{M}}(v'_0) = 0$. Since $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_0}\right) \geq 1$ and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0}\right) \geq 1$, it follows that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_0 \setminus \{v_0\}}\right) \geq 1$ and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0 \setminus \{v'_0\}}\right) \geq 1$. Thus $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_0 \setminus \{v_0\}}\right) \geq 1$ and $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0 \setminus \{v'_0\}}\right) \geq 1$. We also have $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}_1}|_{\mathrm{relin}(e)}\right) \geq D_{\mathscr{M}_1}(v_1) = 2$. Furthermore, we have

$$(\widetilde{\Gamma}_0 \setminus \{v_0\}) \cup (\widetilde{\Gamma}'_0 \setminus \{v'_0\}) \cup \mathrm{relin}(e) \cup V^-_{\mathscr{M}_1} = \widetilde{\Gamma},$$

and the valences at v_0 and v'_0 of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ are at least 2. Thus by Lemma 4.6, $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at q. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.9. □

5.3. **Vertices-separating sections.** We keep the setting that $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$ is the canonical skeleton of X. In this subsection, we construct a model which has global sections that separate vertices. We begin with the definitions of global sections of models which will be used to separate vertices.

Definition 5.13. Let $v_1, v_2 \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be vertices, and let C_1 and C_2 be the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $[C_1] = v_1$ and $[C_2] = v_2$. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a Deligne–Mumford semistable model of (X, L).

(1) We call $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ a *v_1-base section* if $\widetilde{s}(p) \neq 0$ for some $p \in C_1$.
(2) Suppose that $v_1 \neq v_2$. We call $\widetilde{s} \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ a *(v_1, v_2)-separating section* if $\widetilde{s}|_{C_1} = 0$ and $\widetilde{s}|_{C_2} \neq 0$ as a global section of $\mathscr{L}|_{C_1}$ and one of $\mathscr{L}|_{C_2}$, respectively.

The following lemma shows a merit of a vertex-base section and a vertices-separating section in separating vertices of Γ.

Lemma 5.14. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be distinct vertices. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a Deligne–Mumford semistable model of (X, L). Let $\widetilde{s}_0$ be a v_1-base section and let $\widetilde{s}_1$ be a (v_1, v_2)-separating section. Set $g := \widetilde{s}_1/\widetilde{s}_0$ and $f := g|_X$. Then $-\log|f(v_1)| > 0$ and $-\log|f(v_2)| \leq 0$, and in particular, $-\log|f(v_1)| \neq -\log|f(v_2)|$.*

Proof. Let C_1 and C_2 be the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ corresponding to v_1 and v_2, respectively. Then $\mathrm{ord}_{C_1}(g) > 0$ and $\mathrm{ord}_{C_2}(g) \leq 0$. Thus the lemma follows. □

The goal of this subsection is the following proposition.

Proposition 5.15. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ be distinct vertices. Assume that $\deg(L) \geq 3g - 1$. Then there exists a Deligne–Mumford semistable model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_1-base section and a (v_1, v_2)-separating section or such that $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_2-base section and a (v_2, v_1)-separating section.*

Remark 5.16. Suppose that v_1 and v_2 belong to different islands of the canonical weighted skeleton $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$. Let φ be the tropicalization as in Theorem 4.17. Then by condition (iii) in this theorem, we have $\varphi(v_1) \neq \varphi(v_2)$. Therefore, for our purpose to construct a faithful tropicalization, we do not have to take care of such v_1 and v_2. In fact, in the proof of Theorem 4.17, we have already shown Proposition 5.15 for such v_1 and v_2. Therefore, we only have to prove this proposition in the case where v_1 and v_2 belong to the same island.

5.3.1. *Technical lemmas.* We prove some technical lemmas, which are similar to Lemmas 4.6 and 4.5, respectively. In these lemmas, we do not need to assume that $g \geq 2$ or $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$.

Lemma 5.17. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K and let L be a line bundle over X. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model with $\mathscr{X}$ strictly semistable and let Γ be the associated skeleton (not necessarily $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$). Set $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$ and $D_{\mathscr{M}} := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \deg(\mathscr{M}|_C)[C]$. Let C_1 be an irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ and set $v_1 := [C_1] \in V(\mathscr{X})$. Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective and has positive degree. Then $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in C_1 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.*

Proof. Take any $p \in C(k) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. It suffices to show that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective and has positive degree, $\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-p)$ is nef and has positive degree. By Lemma 4.2, it follows that $h^0\left(\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-p)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, and hence $h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ as well. By Lemma 4.1 (1), $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p. Since $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) = h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ by the Serre duality, $H^0(\mathscr{L}) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective by the base-change theorem. Since $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p, this concludes that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. □

Lemma 5.18. *Let X, L, $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$, Γ, $\mathscr{M}$, $D_{\mathscr{M}}$, C_1, and v_1 be as in Lemma 5.17. Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is effective and that $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_1) = 0$. Further, suppose that there exist connected components Γ_1 and Γ_2 of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1\}$ (possibly $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2$) such that:*

(i) $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma_j}) \geq 1$ *for any* $j = 1, 2$;
(ii) *the valence of* $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \{v_1\}$ *at* v_1 *is at least* 2.

Then $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in C_1 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.

Proof. Take any $p \in C_1(k) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. It suffices to show that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. Set $D_j := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s), [C] \in \Gamma_j} C$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then each D_j $(j = 1, 2)$ is a connected component of $\mathscr{X}_s - C_1$. Set $M := \mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$.

Claim 5.18.1. *We have $h^0\left(M(-p)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$.*

Proof. By condition (i) of the lemma, $M(-p)|_{D_j}$ is nef and has positive degree for $j = 1, 2$. By Lemma 4.2, it follows that $h^0\left(M(-p)|_{D_j}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ for $j = 1, 2$. Set

$$D_3 := \begin{cases} D_1 & \text{if } D_1 = D_2 \\ D_1 + D_2 & \text{if } D_1 \neq D_2. \end{cases}$$

Further, set $\Sigma := C_1 \cap D_3$, which is a Cartier divisor on C_1. Then by condition (ii) and $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_1) = 0$, $\deg\left(M(-p)|_{C_1}(\Sigma)\right) \geq 1$, and hence by Lemma 4.2, $h^0\left(\left(M(-p)|_{C_1}(\Sigma)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. By Lemma 4.4, it follows that $h^0\left(M(-p)|_{C_1+D_3}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}}$ is effective, $M(-p)|_{\mathscr{X}_s - (C_1+D_3)}$ is nef, and hence Lemma 4.4 gives us $h^0\left(M(-p)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. □

By the above claim and Lemma 4.1 (1), $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p. Furthermore, it follows from the claim that $h^0\left(M^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, and hence $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) = 0$ by the Serre duality. By the base-change theorem, it follows that the natural map $H^0(\mathscr{L}) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective. Since $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is free at p, this concludes that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at p. □

5.3.2. *Proof of Proposition 5.15.* The following lemma gives us a sufficient condition for a model to have a vertices-separated section.

Lemma 5.19. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$ with $v_1 \neq v_2$. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a strictly semistable model of (X, L). Assume that there exists a $v_1' \in \Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ such that v_1 and v_1' belong to the same connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ and such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] - [v_1']$ is effective. Then there exists a (v_2, v_1)-separating section of $\mathscr{L}$.*

Proof. Let C_1, C_2, and C_1' be the irreducible components of $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $[C_1] = v_1$, $[C_2] = v_2$, and $[C_1'] = v_1'$. By the assumption of the lemma, let Γ_1 be the connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ such that $v_1, v_1' \in \Gamma_1$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] - [v_1']$, we remark that $v_1, v_1' \in V(\mathscr{X})$. Set $F_1 := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s), [C] \in \Gamma_1} C$. Fix a point $p_1 \in C_1(k) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Set $\Sigma := F_1 \cap C_2$, which is a nontrivial effective Cartier divisor on C_2.

First, we show that $\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma)$ is free at p_1. Since $\mathscr{M}|_{F_1}$ is nef and since $\deg\left(\mathscr{M}|_{C_1}\right) \geq 1$ and $\deg\left(\mathscr{M}|_{C_1'}\right) \geq 1$, it follows that $\mathscr{M}|_{F_1}(-p_1)$ is nef and has positive degree. Since F_1 is connected, Lemma 4.2 gives us $h^0\left(\left(\mathscr{M}|_{F_1}(-p_1)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. We have

$$\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma - p_1) \otimes \omega_{F_1}^{\otimes -1} = \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}\Big|_{F_1}(-p_1) = \mathscr{M}|_{F_1}(-p_1)$$

by the adjunction formula. By the Serre duality, it follows that $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma - p_1)\right) = h^0\left(\left(\mathscr{M}|_{F_1}(-p_1)\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, $\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma)$ is free at p_1.

It follows that there exists a global section η of $\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma)$ such that $\eta(p_1) \neq 0$. Note that $\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}(-\Sigma) \subset \mathscr{L}|_{F_1}$. Extending η to be zero outside of F_1, we obtain a global section η_1 of $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_2}$ such that $\eta_1|_{F_1} = \eta$ as a global section of $\mathscr{L}|_{F_1}$. Since $C_2 \notin \mathrm{Irr}(F_1)$, we have $\eta_1|_{C_2} = 0$.

Since $\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is nef and has positive degree, $h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, and thus $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) = 0$ by the Serre duality. By the base-change theorem, the natural map $H^0(\mathscr{L}) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective. It follows that there exists a global section $\widetilde{s}_1 \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$ such that $\widetilde{s}_1|_{\mathscr{X}_s} = \eta_1$. It is clear that $\widetilde{s}_1$ is a (v_2, v_1)-separating section of $\mathscr{L}$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.15. We may and do assume that Γ is not a singleton. As noted in Remark 5.16, we only consider the case where v_1 and v_2 belong to the same island, which we assume in the following.

Case 1. Suppose that $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ is connected. By Proposition 3.13, there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:

(i) $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model;
(ii) $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) \geq 2$. Then applying Lemma 5.19 in place of v_1, v_2, v_1' with v_2, v_1, v_2, respectively, we see that $\mathscr{L}$ has a (v_1, v_2)-separating section. Further, since $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective, Lemma 5.17 shows that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any point of $C_1 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Thus $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_1-base section, which proves the proposition.

In the following, therefore, we assume that $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) \leq 1$. Then, since $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]) \geq g \geq 2$, we have $\deg\left((D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1])|_{\Gamma\setminus\{v_2\}}\right) \geq 1$. It follows that there exists a $v_1' \in \Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] - [v_1']$ is effective. By Lemma 5.19, $\mathscr{L}$ has a (v_2, v_1)-separating section.

Let us prove the existence of v_2-base section. We have now $-1 \leq (D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2])(v_2) \leq 0$. If $(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2])(v_2) = 0$, then $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2]$ is effective as well as has positive degree, and hence Lemma 5.17 shows that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $q \in C_2 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. This implies that $\mathscr{L}$ has v_2-base section.

We suppose that $(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2])(v_2) = -1$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) = 0$. Since $v_1 \neq v_2$ and v_1 belongs to the same island as v_2, $\{v_2\}$ is not an island of $\bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$, and hence the valence of Γ at v_2 is at least 2. Further, $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ is connected by the assumption of Case 1. By Lemma 5.18, it follows that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any point in $C_2 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Thus there exists a v_2-base section of $\mathscr{L}$.

Case 2. Suppose that $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1\}$ is connected. Then by Case 1, there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ such that $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_1-base section and a (v_1, v_2)-separating section.

Case 3. Suppose that $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1\}$ and $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ are not connected. Let Γ_1° be the connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$ to which v_1 belongs. Set $\Gamma_1 := \Gamma_1^\circ \cup \{v_2\}$ and $\Gamma_2 := \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_1^\circ$. Remark that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \{v_2\}$. Remark also that $\Gamma_1 \neq \{v_2\}$.

Subcase 3.1. Suppose that Γ has a bridge e. Since $\mathrm{relin}(e)$ is contained in one of the connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$, one of the following holds:

(I) v_1 and $\mathrm{relin}(e)$ are contained in the same connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$;
(II) v_2 and $\mathrm{relin}(e)$ are contained in the same connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1\}$

By symmetry, we may and do assume that (I) holds without loss of generality. Then we remark that $e \subset \Gamma_1$.

By Proposition 3.13, there exists a strictly semistable model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:

(i) $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective;
(ii) $\deg\left((D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1])|_{\Gamma'}\right) \geq 1$ for any island Γ' of Γ.

Since $e \subset \Gamma_1$, there exists an island Γ_1' of Γ such that $\Gamma_1' \subset \Gamma_1 \setminus \{v_2\}$. By conditions (i) and (ii) above, it follows that there exists a $v_1' \in \Gamma_1'$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] - [v_1']$ is effective. Since v_1 and v_1' belong to the same connected component of $\Gamma \setminus \{v_2\}$, Lemma 5.19 concludes that $\mathscr{L}$ has a (v_2, v_1)-separating section.

In the rest of this subcase, we construct a v_2-base section of $\mathscr{L}$. Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) \geq 1$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2]$ is effective and has positive degree. Using Lemma 5.17, as in the last paragraph of Case 1, we see that $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_2-base section of $\mathscr{L}$.

Suppose that $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) \leq 0$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) = 0$, and hence $(D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_2])(v_2) = -1$. Let Γ_2' be the island of Γ with $v_2 \in \Gamma_2'$. Since $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) = 0$, it follows from condition (ii) above that there exists a connected component Γ_2'' of $\Gamma_2' \setminus \{v_2\}$ such that $\deg\left(D_{\mathscr{M}}|_{\Gamma_2''}\right) \geq 1$.

We claim that the valence of $\Gamma_2'' \cup \{v_2\}$ at v_2 is at least 2. To show that by contradiction, assume that the valence is 1. Then there exists a unique edge e_2 such that $e_2 \subset \Gamma_2'' \cup \{v_2\}$ and such that v_2 is an end vertex of e_2. Since the valence is 1, e_2 is not a loop. Since Γ_2'' is a connected component of $\Gamma_2' \setminus \{v_2\}$, the uniqueness of e_2 implies that $\Gamma_2' \setminus \mathrm{relin}(e_2)$ is not connected. Since Γ_2' is an island of Γ, it follows that e_2 is a bridge of Γ. However, since an island of $\bar{\Gamma}$ never contains a bridge of $\bar{\Gamma}$ by definition, that is a contradiction.

Now, we apply Lemma 5.18, and then it turns out that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $q \in C_2 \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Thus $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_2-base section.

Subcase 3.2. We consider the case where $\bar{\Gamma}$ does not have a bridge. In this case, we need one more lemma.

Lemma 5.20. *Let v_1, v_2, Γ_1°, Γ_1, and Γ_2 be as in the beginning of Case 3. Assume that $\bar{\Gamma}$ does not have a bridge. Then there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1]$ is effective and and such that one of the following holds, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$:*

(i) *there exists an $v_1' \in \Gamma_1^\circ$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] - [v_1']$ is effective;*
(ii) *$D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_2) \geq 2$.*

Proof. To prove the above lemma, we use the following claim.

Claim 5.20.1. *We keep the setting of Lemma 5.20. Let $E \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ with $\deg(E) \geq g$. Suppose that for any $E' \in |E|$, $E'|_{\Gamma_1^\circ}$ is trivial. Then there exists an $E'' \in |E|$ such that $E''(v_2) \geq 2$.*

Proof. **Step 1.** We prove that Γ_1 does not contain a bridge of Γ. To argue by contradiction, assume that there exists a bridge e of $\bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$ such that $e \subset \Gamma_1$. Recall that $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$, $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \{v_2\}$, and $\Gamma_1^\circ = \Gamma_1 \setminus \{v_2\}$. Then we can take an island Γ' of $\bar{\Gamma}$ such that $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma_1^\circ$. By Proposition 3.9, there exists an $E' \in |E|$ such that $\deg\left(E'|_{\Gamma'}\right) \geq 1$, which shows that $\deg\left(E'|_{\Gamma_1^\circ}\right) \geq 1$. However, this contradicts the assumption of the claim.

Step 2. We prove $g(\Gamma_1) \geq 2$. To argue by contradiction, assume that $g(\Gamma_1) \leq 1$. Recall that Γ_1 is not a singleton, $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$, and that $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \{v_2\}$. Since Γ_1 does not have a bridge by Step 1, it follows that Γ_1 cannot be a tree. Thus $g(\Gamma_1) = 1$. Since Γ_1 does not have a bridge, we see that Γ_1 is a circle. It follows that $\Gamma_1 \setminus \{v_1\}$ is connected, and hence $\Gamma \setminus \{v_1\} = (\Gamma_1 \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup \Gamma_2$ is connected. However, this contradicts to the assumption on v_1 of Case 3. Thus $g(\Gamma_1) \geq 2$.

Step 3. Since $\deg(E) \geq g$, there exists an $E' \in |E|$ by Proposition 3.7. By the assumption of the claim, $\mathrm{Supp}(E') \subset \Gamma_2$, and hence we regard E' as a divisor on Γ_2. Since $g(\Gamma_1)+g(\Gamma_2) = g(\Gamma) \leq g$, Step 2 gives us $g(\Gamma_2) \leq g-2$. Then since $\deg(E' - 2[v_2]) \geq g(\Gamma_2)$, Proposition 3.5 shows that there exists an effective $E_2' \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma_2)$ such that $E_2' + 2[v_2] \sim E'$ as divisors on Γ_2. Regard $E_2' + 2[v_2]$ as a Λ-divisor on Γ, which we denote by E''. Then, since $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$ and $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \{v_2\}$, we have $E'' \sim E$ on Γ as well, and $E''(v_2) \geq 2$. This completes the proof of the claim. □

Let us prove Lemma 5.20. Take a divisor $\tilde{D}_1 \in \mathrm{Div}(X)$ such that $L \otimes \omega_X^{\otimes -1} \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D}_1)$, and consider a linear system $|\tau_*(\tilde{D}_1)|$ on Γ. By [4, Lemma 2.1], this linear system does not depend on the choice of $\tilde{D}_1$. Set $E := \tau_*(\tilde{D}_1) - [v_1]$. Then $\deg(E) \geq g$. By Proposition 3.7, $|E| \neq \emptyset$.

We divide our argument into two cases. First, suppose that there exists an $E' \in |E|$ such that $\deg\left(E'|_{\Gamma_1^\circ}\right) \geq 1$. Then there exists a $v_1' \in \Gamma_1^\circ$ such that $E'(v_1') \geq 1$. We set $D := E' + [v_1]$. Remark that $D \sim \tau_*(\tilde{D}_1)$. By Proposition 3.12, there exists a good model $\mathscr{X}$ and a line bundle $\mathscr{M}$ over $\mathscr{X}$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} = D$. Set $\mathscr{L} := \mathscr{M} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] = D - [v_1] = E'$, which is effective. Further, the above construction immediately shows that $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ is a model of (X, L) which satisfies condition (i) of Lemma 5.20. This completes the proof of the lemma in this case.

Next, suppose that there does not exist an $E' \in |E|$ such that $\deg\left(E'|_{\Gamma_1^\circ}\right) \geq 1$. Then by Claim 5.20.1, there exists an $E'' \in |E|$ such that $E''(v_2) \geq 2$. Set $D := E'' + [v_1]$. By the same way as in Case 1, we construct a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ such that $D_{\mathscr{M}} = D$, where $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$.

Note that $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_1] = E''$ is effective. Further, it is straightforward to see that this model satisfies (ii) of Lemma 5.20. Thus we obtain the lemma. □

Now, we return to the proof of Proposition 5.15, subcase 3.2. We take a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ as in Lemma 5.20. Suppose that this model satisfies (i) in Lemma 5.20. Then by Lemma 5.19, $\mathscr{L}$ has a (v_2, v_1)-separating section. Further, by the same argument using Lemma 5.18 as before, $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_2-base section. Thus Proposition 5.15 holds in this case.

Suppose that $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ satisfies (ii) in Lemma 5.20. Then by Lemma 5.19, $\mathscr{L}$ has a (v_1, v_2)-separating section. Further, since $D_{\mathscr{M}}(v_1) \geq 1$ where $\mathscr{M} = \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$, the same argument using Lemma 5.17 as before shows that $\mathscr{L}$ has a v_1-base section. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.15. □

5.4. **Faithful tropicalization of the canonical skeleton.** We construct a faithful tropicalization of the canonical skeleton.

Theorem 5.21. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 2$, and let L be a line bundle on X. Suppose that $\deg(L) \geq 3g - 1$. Then there exist $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the map $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ defined by $\varphi := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$ gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ_{can}.*

Proof. **Step 1.** By Theorem 4.17, we take $s_0, \dots, s_{N_1} \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the map $\varphi_1 : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^{N_1}$ defined by $\varphi_1 := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_1}|)$ satisfies conditions (i)–(iii) in that theorem for $\varphi = \varphi_1$. Remark that φ_1 is unimodular, in particular.

Step 2. We take care of the separation of points in the interior of an edge. We set $\{e_1, \dots, e_\alpha\} := \{e \in E(\mathscr{X}_s^{\mathrm{st}}) \mid e \text{ is of connected type}\}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, \alpha$, Proposition 5.5 gives us a model $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{L}_i)$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{L}_i$ has an e_i-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{e_i}$ and a separating section $\widetilde{s}_1^{e_i}$ for e_i. Set $s_{N_1+2i-1} := \widetilde{s}_0^{e_i}|_X$ and $s_{N_1+2i} := \widetilde{s}_1^{e_i}|_X$ for $i = 1, \dots, \alpha$, and set $N_2 := N_1 + 2\alpha$. Define a map $\varphi_2 : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TR}^{N_2}$ by $\varphi_2 := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_1}| : -\log|s_{N_1+1}| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_2}|)$. Since φ_1 is unimodular, so is φ_2 (cf. Remark 2.14).

Let $x, y \in \Gamma$ be distinct points that belong to the interior of come common edge e. If e is of disconnected type, then $\varphi_1(x) \neq \varphi_1(y)$ by condition (i) in Theorem 4.17, and hence $\varphi_2(x) \neq \varphi_2(y)$. Suppose that e is of connected type. We divide e at the middle point and let e_1 and e_2 be the 1-simplices arising from this division. If $x, y \in e_1$ or $x, y \in e_2$, then by condition (ii) in Theorem 4.17, we have $\varphi_1(x) \neq \varphi_1(y)$ and hence $\varphi_2(x) \neq \varphi_2(y)$. If $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e_1)$ and $y \in \mathrm{relin}(e_1)$, then by and Lemma 5.4, we obtain $\varphi_2(x) \neq \varphi_2(y)$. Thus φ_2 separate distinct two points that belong to the interior of the same edge.

Step 3. We take care of separation of two distinct points such that one of those points is not a vertex. We put a numbering to the elements of

$$\{(e, f) \in E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \times E(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \mid e \text{ is of connected type}, e \neq f\}$$

and let $\{(e_i, f_i)\}_{i=1}^{\beta}$ denote this set. For each i, Proposition 5.8 gives us a model a model $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{L}_i)$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{L}_i$ has an e_i-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{e_i}$ and an (e_i, f_i)-separating section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i, f_i)}$. Set $s_{N_2+2i-1} := \widetilde{s}_0^{e_i}|_X$ and $s_{N_2+2i} := \widetilde{s}_1^{(e_i, f_i)}\Big|_X$ for $i = 1, \dots, \beta$, and set $N_3 := N_2 + 2\alpha$. Consider the map $\varphi_3 : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TR}^{N_3}$ defined by $\varphi_3 := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_2}| : -\log|s_{N_2+1}| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_3}|)$. Remark that since φ_2 is unimodular, so is φ_3 (cf. Remark 2.14).

Let $x, y \in \Gamma$ be distinct points. Assume that not both of x, y are not vertices. Then we are going to show that $\varphi_3(x) \neq \varphi_3(y)$. Without loss of generality, we may and do assume that there exists an edge e with $x \in \mathrm{relin}(e)$. If $y \in \mathrm{relin}(e)$, then $\varphi_2(x) \neq \varphi_2(y)$,

and hence $\varphi_3(x) \neq \varphi_3(y)$. Suppose that $y \notin \mathrm{relin}(e)$. Then there exists an edge f with $f \neq e$ such that $y \in f$. We write $(e, f) = (e_i, f_i)$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, \beta$. By Lemma 5.7, $-\log|s_{N_2+2i}/s_{N_2+2i-1}(x)| \neq -\log|s_{N_2+2i}/s_{N_2+2i-1}(y)|$, and hence $\varphi_3(x) \neq \varphi_3(y)$. Thus $\varphi_3(x) \neq \varphi_3(y)$ if $x \neq y$ and not both of x and y are vertices.

Step 4. We take care of separation of two distinct vertices. Set

$$W := \{(v, w) \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \times V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}}) \mid v \neq w, \text{ and } v \text{ and } w \text{ belong to the same island}\}.$$

For any $(v, w) \in W$, Proposition 5.15 gives us a model $(\mathscr{X}^{(v,w)}, \mathscr{L}^{(v,w)})$ such that $\mathscr{L}^{(v,w)}$ has a v-separating section and a (v, w)-separating section or has a w-separating section and a (w, v)-separating section. Noting that, we take a (indexed) subset $\{(v_i, w_i)\}_{i=1}^{\gamma}$ in such a way that:

- the model $\mathscr{L}^{(v_i,w_i)}$ has a v_i-base section $\widetilde{s}_0^{v_i}$ and a (v_i, w_i)-separating section $\widetilde{s}_1^{(v_i,w_i)}$;
- for any $(v, w) \in W$, there exists a unique $i = 1, \ldots, \gamma$ such that $\{v, w\} = \{v_i, w_i\}$.

Set $s_{N_3+2i-1} := \widetilde{s}_0^{v_i}|_X$ and $s_{N_3+2i} := \widetilde{s}_1^{(v_i,w_i)}\Big|_X$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \gamma$, and set $N := N_3 + 2\gamma$. We define $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TR}^N$ by $\varphi := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N_3}| : -\log|s_{N_3+1}| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$. Since φ_3 is unimodular, so is φ (cf. Remark 2.14).

Take any distinct $v, w \in V(\mathscr{X}^{\mathrm{st}})$. If v and w do not belong to some common island, then by condition (iii) in Theorem 4.17 $\varphi_1(v) \neq \varphi_1(w)$, and hence $\varphi(v) \neq \varphi(w)$. Suppose that v and w belong to the same island. Then we can write $(v, w) = (v_i, w_i)$ or $(w, v) = (v_i, w_i)$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, \gamma$. By Lemma 5.14, it follows that $-\log|s_{N_3+2i}/s_{N_3+2i-1}(v)| \neq -\log|s_{N_3+2i}/s_{N_3+2i-1}(w)|$, and hence $\varphi(v) \neq \varphi(w)$. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

6. Faithful tropicalization of minimal skeleta in low genera

Let X be a smooth projective curve of any genus g. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a strictly semistable model of X. We say that $\mathscr{X}$ is *minimal* if $\mathscr{X}_s$ does not have a (-1)-curve. Remark that in the case where $g \geq 1$, $\mathscr{X}$ is minimal if and only if $\mathscr{X}$ is Deligne–Mumford semistable. Let Γ be a skeleton of X^{an}. We say that Γ is *minimal* if there exists a minimal model $\mathscr{X}$ of X with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X})$. Remark that if Γ is minimal, then any model $\mathscr{X}'$ with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}')$ is minimal.

In the previous section, we have shown the existence of faithful tropicalization of the minimal skeleta when $g \geq 2$. In this section, we prove that when $g = 0, 1$.

6.1. **Case where the minimal skeleton is a singleton.** The existence of faithful tropicalization of a minimal skeleton is trivial when $g = 0$. Indeed, suppose that $g = 0$. Then a minimal skeleton Γ is a point. Therefore, if $\deg(L) \geq 1$, then there exists two non-zero sections $s_0, s_1 \in H^0(L)$, and the tropicalization with respect to those sections gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

We assume that $g = 1$. Then, we have two possibilities of the configuration of the minimal skeleton Γ: one is a singleton; the other is a circle. If Γ is a singleton, then the existence of faithful tropicalization is again trivial. Indeed, if $\deg(L) \geq 3$, then there exist two nontrivial sections $s_0, s_1 \in H^0(L)$, and the tropicalization with respect to those sections gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

6.2. **Case where the minimal skeleton is a circle.** Assume that $g = 1$. Let Γ be the minimal skeleton of X^{an}. Since $g \geq 1$, it is the canonical skeleton. Since there is nothing to do if Γ is a singleton, assume that Γ is a circle. We fix a point $v_0 \in \Gamma_\Lambda$ in the following argument. Further, we write $e := \Gamma \setminus \{v_0\}$.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathscr{X}$ be a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X. We say that $\mathscr{X}$ is *good* if there exists a $C_0 \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ such that $[C_0] = v_0$ and such that $E := \mathscr{X}_s - C_0$ is a (-2)-chain with symmetric multiplicities.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that* $\deg(L) \geq 3$. *Then for any* $x, y \in \Gamma_\Lambda$, *there exists a model* $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ *of* (X, L) *such that* $\mathscr{X}$ *is good in the above sense and such that* $D_{\mathscr{L}} - [x] - [y]$ *is effective.*

Proof. Take a divisor $\tilde{D}$ on X with $L \cong \mathcal{O}_X(\tilde{D})$. Then $\tau_*(\tilde{D}) \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ and the linear system $\left|\tau_*(\tilde{D})\right|$ does not depend on the choice of $\tilde{D}$. Since $\deg(\tau_*(\tilde{D}) - [x] - [y]) \geq 1$, $\left|\tau_*(\tilde{D})\right| \neq \emptyset$ by Proposition 3.7. Thus there exists an effective $E \in \mathrm{Div}_\Lambda(\Gamma)$ such that $E + [x] + [y] \sim \tau_*(\tilde{D})$. By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3.12, we construct a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) such that $\mathscr{X}$ is good in the above sense and such that $D_{\mathscr{L}} = E + [x] + [y]$. It is clear that this model satisfies the desired conditions. □

Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X, L), and let $\widetilde{s}$ be a nontrivial global section of $\mathscr{L}$. We call $\widetilde{s}$ a *base section* if $\widetilde{s}(p) \neq 0$ for any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Suppose furthermore that $\mathscr{X}$ is good, and then we define the stepwise vertical divisor $\mathscr{V}_e$ by the same way as in § 4.3. We call $\widetilde{s}$ a *unimodularity section* if $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{V}_e$ is effective and trivial over some neighborhood of $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$.

Proposition 6.3. *Assume that* $\deg(L) \geq 3$. *Then there exists a model* $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ *such that* $\mathscr{X}$ *is good and* $\mathscr{L}$ *has a base section and a unimodularity section.*

Proof. Apply Lemma 6.2 for $x = y = v_0$, and we obtain a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good such that $D_{\mathscr{L}} - 2[v_0]$ is effective. By the same argument using Lemma 4.5 as in the proof of Lemma 4.15 (1), we show that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, and then by the same argument as the proof of Proposition 4.14, we obtain a base section.

We set $\mathscr{L}_1 := \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{V}_e)$, where $e := \Gamma \setminus \{v_0\}$. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.15 (3), we see that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at any $p \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. By the same argument as the roof of Proposition 4.14, we obtain a unimodularity section of $\mathscr{L}$. □

Let $\mathscr{X}$ is a good model of X, and let $[C_0] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ with $[C_0] = v_0$. Since the maximal (-2)-chain $E := \mathscr{X}_s - C_0$ has symmetric multiplicity, we can consider a separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ for e as Definition 5.2 also in this setting. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a model of L. We call a nonzero global section s of $\mathscr{L}$ an *separating section* if there exists a separating divisor $\mathscr{A}$ (for e) such that $\mathrm{div}(s) - \mathscr{A}$ is trivial at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})$.

Lemma 6.4. *Assume that* $\deg(L) \geq 3$. *Then there exists a model* $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ *of* (X, L) *such that* $\mathscr{X}$ *is good in the above sense and such that* $\mathscr{L}$ *has a base section and a separating section.*

Proof. Let $v_1 \in \Gamma$ be the point antipodal to v_0. Apply Lemma 6.2 for $x = v_0$ and $y = v_1$, and we obtain a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with $\mathscr{X}$ good such that $D_{\mathscr{L}} - [v_0] - [v_1]$ is effective. By the same argument of Step 2 in the proof of Proposition 5.5, one shows that $\mathscr{L}$ has a base section.

We set $\mathscr{L}_1 := \mathscr{L}(-\mathscr{A})$. By the same argument of Step 3 in the proof of Proposition 5.5, one sees that $\mathscr{L}_1$ is free at any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})$, and hence there exists a section $\widetilde{s}_1 \in H^0(\mathscr{L}_1)$ such that $\widetilde{s}_1(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{A})$. By the same argument of the last paragraph of the proof of Proposition 5.5, this shows the existence of a separating section of $\mathscr{L}$. □

Since we have a model that has a base section and a unimodularity section, the same argument as the proof of Theorem 4.17 gives us a unimodular tropicalization of $\Gamma = \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. Furthermore, since we have a model that has a base section and a separating section, the same argument as the proof of Theorem 5.21 gives us a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

Together with the remarks in § 6.1, we have shown the following theorem.

Theorem 6.5. *Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g = 0, 1$, and let Γ be a minimal skeleton of X^{an}. Let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that*

$$\deg(L) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g = 0 \\ 3 & \text{if } g = 1. \end{cases}$$

Then there exist $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the tropicalization map $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ defined by $\varphi = (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$ gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

7. Faithful tropicalization of an arbitrary skeleton

In this section, we prove the main theorem. Since we have Remark 2.6, we focus on a complete skeleton. In this section, let X be a smooth projective over K of genus $g \geq 0$, and let L be a line bundle over X.

7.1. **Set-up and notation.** Let Γ be a complete skeleton of X^{an}. Then there exists a complete strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$. Recall that $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^m \Delta(\sigma_i)$. We set $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma) := \{\sigma_1(K), \dots, \sigma_m(K)\}$ of $X(K)$; this is well-defined for Γ and does not depend on the choice of $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$. We call each element of $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)$ a *leaf of* Γ. Remark that each leaf $\sigma_i(K)$ is the limit point of the end $\Delta(\sigma_i)$, that is, $\Delta(\sigma_i) \cup \{\sigma_i(K)\}$ is the closure of $\Delta(\sigma_i)$ in X^{an}. Remark also that $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(\sigma_i(K)) = \sigma_i(k)$ and hence $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)) = \{\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_m(k)\}$. Since $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ is a strictly semistable pair, $\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_m(k)$ are all distinct.

The special fiber $\mathscr{X}_s$ has (-1)-curves, in general. Applying Proposition 2.9 to $\mathscr{X}$ successively, we obtain a morphism $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$, where $\mathscr{X}_s^{\min}$ does not have a (-1)-curve. We call $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ a *minimal model of X under $\mathscr{X}$*. If $g \geq 1$, then $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ is a Deligne–Mumford semistable curve and is uniquely characterized by $V(\mathscr{X}^{\min}) = V(\mathscr{X}) \cap \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}$. If $g = 0$, on the other hand, then $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ is not necessarily unique.

Let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$ be as above. By the definition of μ, there exists a unique connected curve D in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that μ restricts to an isomorphism $\phi : D \to \mathscr{X}_s^{\min}$. Remark that $S(\mathscr{X}^{\min}) = \bigcup_{q \in \mathrm{Sing}(D)} \Delta_q$.

For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, we fix the following notation. Since $(\mathscr{X}^{\min}; \mu \circ \sigma_i)$ is a strictly semistable pair, we consider the end $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$ in Γ. We have $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}^{\min}) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^m \Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$. Let E^i be a chain of curves in $\mathscr{X}_s$ characterized by $\{[C] \in \Gamma \mid C \in \mathrm{Irr}(E^i)\} = V(\mathscr{X}) \cap \Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$. We write the irreducible components of E^i for $E_0^i, \dots, E_{r_i}^i$ in such a way that the vertex $[E_0^i]$ is the boundary point of $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$ and $E_\alpha^i \cap E_{\alpha+1}^i \neq \emptyset$ for $\alpha = 0, \dots, r_i - 1$. Note that $\sigma_i(k) \in E_{r_i}^i \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Let p_α^i denote the node in $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $\{p_\alpha^i\} = E_\alpha^i \cap E_{\alpha+1}^i$ for $\alpha = 0, \dots, r_i - 1$. Remark that $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i) = \bigcup_{\alpha=0}^{r_i-1} \Delta_{p_\alpha^i} \cup \Delta(\sigma_i)$ and that this is isometric to a closed half line.

Assume that $r_i \geq 1$. For each $0 \leq \alpha \leq r_i - 1$, the partial normalization at p_α^i has exactly two connected components. Let F_α^i be the one which contains $E_{r_i}^i$. Remark that F_0^i is the connected component of $\mathscr{X}_s - D$ that contains $\sigma_i(k)$, where D is the curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that μ restricts to the isomorphism $D \to \mathscr{X}_s^{\min}$, as above.

We regard F^i_α as a curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$. Then F^i_α satisfies the condition (F) in § 4.2. Let $\mathscr{F}^i_\alpha$ be the fundamental vertical divisor with support F^i_α. Using those fundamental divisors, we define a vertical effective divisor on $\mathscr{X}$ for a leaf: Let P be a leaf of Γ, and let i be the one with $P = \sigma_i(K)$; we set

$$\mathscr{W}_P := \sum_{\alpha=0}^{r_i-1} \mathscr{F}^i_\alpha, \tag{7.19}$$

which we call the *stepwise vertical divisor associated to* P. By definition, $\mathscr{W}_P = 0$ if and only if $r_i = 0$. Remark that $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{W}_P) = F^i_0$ if $r_i \geq 1$.

Remark 7.1. We calculate the order of $\mathscr{W}_P$ at each irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$. Suppose that $r_i \geq 1$. Then $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{W}_P) = F^i_0$, which is a tree of irreducible components. For any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(D)$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{W}_P) = 0$. For each $\alpha = 1, \ldots, r_i$, let λ^i_α denote the distance between $[E^i_0]$ and $[E^i_\alpha]$. Then $\mathrm{ord}_{E^i_\alpha}(\mathscr{W}_P) = \lambda^i_\alpha$. To see the order of $\mathscr{W}_P$ at the other irreducible components, we take any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(F^i_0) \setminus \mathrm{Irr}(E^i)$. Since F^i_0 is a tree of irreducible components, there exists a unique $\alpha_C = 1, \ldots, r_i$ such that $[E^i_{\alpha_C}]$ is the point in $\{[E^i_\alpha] \mid 1 \leq \alpha \leq r_i\}$ that is the nearest to $[C]$. Using this α_C, we have $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{W}_P) = \mathrm{ord}_{E^i_{\alpha_C}}(\mathscr{W}_P) = \lambda^i_{\alpha_C}$.

7.2. **Leaf-unimodularity sections.** We define key notions of global sections of a model, which will give global sections of L used in a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

Definition 7.2. Let P be a leaf of Γ. Let $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m)$ be a strictly semistable pair with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m)$, let $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ be a minimal model of X under $\mathscr{X}$, and let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$ be the morphism extending the identity. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line bundle over $\mathscr{X}$ such that $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ is a model of (X, L). Set $B := \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cup \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma))$. Let $\widetilde{s}$ be a global section of $\mathscr{L}$.

(1) We call $\widetilde{s}$ a *base section* if $\widetilde{s}(p) \neq 0$ for any $p \in B$.
(2) We call $\widetilde{s}$ a *P-unimodularity section* if for the $i = 1, \ldots, m$ with $\sigma_i(K) = P$, $\mathrm{div}(\widetilde{s}) - \mathscr{W}_P - \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial at any $p \in B$

Remark that the notion of base section does not depend on P.

The following lemma shows us importance of a base section and a leaf-unimodularity section for each leaf.

Lemma 7.3. *Let P be a leaf of Γ. Let $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m)$, $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$, and $\mathscr{L}$ be as in Definition 7.2. Let $\widetilde{s}_0$ be a base section of $\mathscr{L}$ and let $\widetilde{s}^P_1$ be a P-unimodularity section of $\mathscr{L}$. Set $s_0 := \widetilde{s}^P_0\big|_X$ and $s^P_1 := \widetilde{s}^P_1\big|_X$. Further, set $f := s^P_1/s_0$, which is a non-zero rational function on X. Define $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \setminus X(K) \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi := -\log|f|$. Let $i(= 1, \ldots, m)$ be the one with $P = \sigma_i(K)$. Then the following hold.*

(1) *The map φ gives an isometry from $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$ to $[0, +\infty)$.*
(2) *For any $j \neq i$, φ maps $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_j) \setminus \Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$ to a constant. Further, if $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_j(K)) \neq \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)$, then φ maps $\Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_j)$ to 0.*
(3) *The map φ maps $S(\mathscr{X}^{\min})$ to 0.*

Proof. Set $g := \widetilde{s}^P_1/\widetilde{s}_0$, which is a non-zero rational function on $\mathscr{X}$. Note that $g|_X = f$. By definition, there exists an open neighborhood $\mathscr{U}$ of $B(:= \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cup \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)))$ such that $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W}_P - \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial on $\mathscr{U}$.

Let E^i be the chain in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $\{[C] \mid C \in \mathrm{Irr}(E^i)\} = V(\mathscr{X}) \cap \Delta(\mu \circ \sigma_i)$. Let λ_{E^i} denote the length of the corresponding path $\Delta_{E^i} \subset \Gamma$. (Remark that with the notation in Remark 7.1, λ_{E^i} equals the distance between $[E^i_0]$ and $[E^i_{r_i}]$ in Γ, which is denoted by $\lambda^i_{r_i}$.) Since $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W}_P - \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial on $\mathscr{U}$, the calculation in Remark 7.1 shows that φ gives an isometry from Δ_{E^i} to $[0, \lambda_{E^i}]$.

Let h be a local equation of the Cartier divisor $\sigma_i(R)$ and we take $\varpi \in K^\times$ such that $v_K(\varpi) = \lambda_{E^i}$. Then there exists a rational function u on $\mathscr{X}$ such that u is a unit regular function on some open neighborhood of $\sigma_i(R)$ and satisfies $g = \varpi u h$. Since $-\log|h|_X|$ gives an isometry from $\Delta(\sigma_i)$ to $[0,+\infty)$, $\varphi = -\log|f|$ gives an isometry from $\Delta(\sigma_i)$ to $[\lambda_{E^i},+\infty)$. Since we have the simplicial decomposition $\Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_i) = \Delta_{E^i} \cup \Delta(\sigma_i)$, this concludes that φ gives an isometry from $\Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_i)$ to $[0,+\infty)$. Thus we have (1).

Take any $j = 1,\dots,m$ with $j \neq i$. Suppose that $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_j(K)) \neq \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)$. Recall that $P = \sigma_i(K)$. We use the notation in § 7.1. It follows from $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_j(K)) \neq \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_i(K))$ that $F_0^i \cap F_0^j = \emptyset$. This means in particular that $\{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(F_0^i) \mid [C] \in \Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_j)\} = \emptyset$. Since $\mathrm{Supp}(\mathscr{W}_P) = F_0^i$, it follows that for any $C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ with $[C] \in \Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_j)$, we have $\mathrm{ord}_C(\mathscr{W}_P) = 0$. Further, since $\sigma_j(k) \in F_0^j$ and $\sigma_i(k) \in F_0^i$, $\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial on some neighborhood of $\sigma_j(R)$. Since $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W}_P - \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial on $\mathscr{U}$, this shows that $\varphi(\Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_j)) = \{0\}$.

Suppose that $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_j(K)) = \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)$. Since $\mu\circ\sigma_j(k) = \mu\circ\sigma_i(k)$, we have $F_0^i = F_0^j$. We write $E^i = E_0^i + \cdots + E_{r_i}^i$ and $E^j = E_0^j + \cdots + E_{r_j}^j$ as in the notation fixed in § 7.1. Since $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\sigma_j(K)) = \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)$, there exists $1 \le s_{ij} \le \min\{r_i, r_j\}$ such that $E_\alpha^i = E_\alpha^j$ for $0 \le \alpha \le s_{ij}$ and $E_\alpha^i \neq E_\beta^j$ for $\alpha,\beta \ge s_{ij}+1$. Let $\lambda_{s_{ij}}^i$ be the distance between $[E_0^i]$ and $[E_{s_{ij}}^i]$ in Γ. For any $\beta = s_{ij}+1,\dots,r_j$, Remark 7.1 tells us $\mathrm{ord}_{E_\beta^j}(\mathscr{W}_P) = \lambda_{s_{ij}}^i$. Furthermore, let $\varpi_{s_{ij}}^i \in K^\times$ such that $-\log|\varpi_{s_{ij}}^i| = \lambda_{s_{ij}}^i$. Then $\varpi_{s_{ij}}^i$ is a local equation of $\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_i(R)$ on some neighborhood of $\sigma_j(R)$. Since $\mathrm{div}(g) - \mathscr{W}_P - \sigma_i(R)$ is trivial over $\mathscr{U}$, this shows that $\varphi(\Delta(\sigma_j)) = \{\lambda_{s_{ij}}^i\}$. Thus we have $\varphi(\Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_j) \setminus \Delta(\mu\circ\sigma_i)) = \{\lambda_{s_{ij}}^i\}$, which completes the proof of (2).

Let D be the curve in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$ restricts to an isomorphism $\phi : D \to \mathscr{X}_s^{\min}$. For any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(D)$, g is invertible at q by the definition of P-unimodularity sections, and it follows that $\varphi = -\log|f|$ maps Δ_q to 0. Since $S(\mathscr{X}^{\min}) = \bigcup_{q\in\mathrm{Sing}(D)} \Delta_q$, φ maps $S(\mathscr{X}^{\min})$ to 0. This shows (3). Thus we prove the lemma. □

The key is the following proposition.

Proposition 7.4. *For any leaf P of Γ, there exists a strictly semistable model $(\mathscr{X},\mathscr{L})$ with the following properties:*

(i) *There exist sections $\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_m$ of $\mathscr{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ such that $(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_m)$ is a strictly semistable pair with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X};\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_m)$;*
(ii) *$\mathscr{L}$ has a base section and a P-unimodularity section.*

7.3. **Proof of Proposition 7.4.** To construct a model as in Proposition 7.4, we introduce the notions of good models for a leaf.

Definition 7.5 (good models for a leaf)**.** Fix a leaf P of Γ. Let $(\mathscr{X},\mathscr{L})$ be a model of (X,L). We call $(\mathscr{X},\mathscr{L})$ a *good model for P* if it satisfies the following conditions, where $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$.

(i) The model $\mathscr{X}$ is a strictly semistable model of X such that $S(\mathscr{X}) \subset \Gamma$ and $\mathscr{X}_s$ does not have a (-1)-curve, namely, $\mathscr{X}$ is minimal.
(ii) Let C_P be the irreducible component of $\mathscr{X}_s$ with $\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P) \in C_P$ and set $v_P := [C_P]$. Then $D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_P]$ is effective, where $D_{\mathscr{M}} := \sum_{C\in\mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \deg(\mathscr{M}|_C)\,[C]$.
(iii) We have $\deg(D_{\mathscr{M}}) \ge 3$. Further, if $g \ge 2$, then for any island Γ' of $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathrm{can}}$, we have $\deg((D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_P])|_{\Gamma'}) \ge 1$.

Suppose that $\mathscr{X}$ is strictly semistable and minimal model of X. Further, suppose that $g \geq 1$. Then $\mathscr{X}$ is a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X. Thus the condition $S(\mathscr{X}) \subset \Gamma$, which is a part of condition (i) in Definition 7.5, is automatically satisfied in this case.

We prove a couple of technical lemmas that will be used in constructing a base section and a leaf-unimodularity section.

Lemma 7.6. *Let P be a leaf of Γ. Let $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ be a good model of (X, L) for P. Put $\mathscr{M} := \mathscr{L} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Let $q \in \mathscr{X}_s(k)$ be a point.*

(1) *Suppose that $q \notin \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Then we have $h^0\left(\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-q - \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ and $h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$.*

(2) *Suppose that $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Let $\nu : \widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s} \to \mathscr{X}_s$ be the partial normalization at q. Then $h^0\left(\nu^*\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$.*

Proof. We set $M := \mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))$ and $D_M := \sum_{C \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)} \deg(M|_C)[C]$. Then $D_M = D_{\mathscr{M}} - [v_P]$, and thus D_M is effective by Definition 7.5 (ii) and has positive degree by Definition 7.5 (iii).

(1) Suppose that $q \notin \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Then there exists a unique $C_1 \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathscr{X}_s)$ such that $q \in C_1$, and let set $v_1 := [C_1] \in V(\mathscr{X})$. By Definition 7.5 (iii), $\deg(D_M - [v_1]) \geq 1$. If $D_M - [v_1]$ is effective, then $M(-q)$ is nef and has positive degree, and hence by Lemma 4.2, we obtain $h^0((M(-q))^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. Suppose that $D_M - [v_1]$ is not effective. Then $(D_M - [v_1])(v_1) = -1$, and v_1 is the only point at which $D_M - [v_1]$ is negative. By the same argument as the proof of Claim 5.18.1, we obtain $h^0\left((M(-q))^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, which shows the first equality. Since $\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1} \subset \left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-q - \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}$, the other equality follows from that equality.

(2) Suppose that $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$. Set $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma_{\mathrm{can}} \setminus \mathrm{relin}(\Delta_q)$. Then $D_M|_{\widetilde{\Gamma}}$ is effective and has positive degree. Further, by Definition 7.5 (iii), the same argument as in the proof of Claim 4.6.1 shows that $h^0\left(\nu^*\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. □

Lemma 7.7. *With notation and assumptions being in Lemma 7.6, we have the following:*

(1) *$\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))$ is free at any $q \in \mathscr{X}_s$.*
(2) *$\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $q \in \mathscr{X}_s$.*

Proof. Assertion (1) follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 7.6. We prove (2). For any $q \in \mathscr{X}_s(k) \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, we have $h^0\left(\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-q - \mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ by Lemma 7.6 (1), and hence $h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-q)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. For any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s)$, if $\nu : \widetilde{\mathscr{X}_s} \to \mathscr{X}_s$ is the partial normalization at q, then $h^0\left(\nu^*\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}(-\mathrm{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(P))\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$ by Lemma 7.6 (2), and hence $h^0\left(\nu^*\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, it follows that $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$ is base-point free. Further, since $h^0\left(\mathscr{M}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}^{\otimes -1}\right) = 0$, we have $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ by the Serre duality, and hence the base-change theorem tells us that the natural homomorphism $H^0(\mathscr{L}) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective. This shows that $\mathscr{L}$ is free at any $q \in \mathscr{X}_s$. □

In the next proposition, we construct a model that dominates a good model for a leaf.

Proposition 7.8. *Let $P \in X(K)$ be a leaf of Γ. Assume that*

$$\deg(L) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g = 0, \\ 3 & \text{if } g = 1, \\ 3g-1 & \text{if } g \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ of (X, L) with the following properties.

(i) *There exist sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ of $\mathscr{X} \to \operatorname{Spec}(R)$ such that $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ is a strictly semistable pair with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$.*

(ii) *Let $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ be a minimal model of X under $\mathscr{X}$ (cf. § 7.1). Then there exists a line bundle $\mathscr{L}^{\min}$ on $\mathscr{X}^{\min}$ such that $(\mathscr{X}^{\min}, \mathscr{L}^{\min})$ is a good model for P and $\mathscr{L} = \mu^*(\mathscr{L}^{\min})$.*

Proof. There exists a strictly semistable pair $(\mathscr{X}_\Gamma; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}_\Gamma; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$. Let $\mathscr{X}^0$ be a minimal model of $\mathscr{X}_\Gamma$. Since $\mathscr{X}^0$ is dominated by $\mathscr{X}_\Gamma$, we have $S(\mathscr{X}^0) \subset \Gamma$.

Suppose that $g \geq 2$. Then $\mathscr{X}^0$ is a Deligne–Mumford strictly semistable model of X. Since $\deg(L) \geq 3g-1$, we take a model $(\mathscr{X}^1, \mathscr{L}^1)$ as in Proposition 3.13 in place of x with v_P such that the identity on X extends to a morphism $\mathscr{X}^1 \to \mathscr{X}^0$. Set $\mathscr{X} := \mathscr{X} \times_{\mathscr{X}^0} \mathscr{X}^1$ and let $\mathscr{L}$ be the pullback of $\mathscr{L}^1$ to $\mathscr{X}$. Then by the construction of $\mathscr{X}^1$ and $\mathscr{X}$, we have $\mathscr{X}^{\min} = \mathscr{X}^1$, and $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ has the required properties.

Suppose that $g = 1$ and that the canonical skeleton is not a singleton. Then similar argument using Lemma 6.2 instead of Proposition 3.13 constructs a model with the required properties.

Suppose that $g = 1$ and that the canonical skeleton is a singleton, or suppose that $g = 0$. In this case, $\mathscr{X}^0$ is a smooth proper model, and there exists a line bundle $\mathscr{L}^0$ over $\mathscr{X}^0$ such that $\mathscr{L}^0|_X = L$. Set $\mathscr{X} := \mathscr{X}_\Gamma$ and let $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^0$ be the morphism extending the identity on X. Set $\mathscr{L} := \mu^*(\mathscr{L}^0)$. Then it is straightforward to check that $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ has the required properties. □

Proof of Proposition 7.4. We take a model $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{L})$ as in Proposition 7.8. We show that $\mathscr{L}$ has a base section and a P-unimodularity section. By condition (ii) in Proposition 7.8, there exist sections $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ of $\mathscr{X} \to \operatorname{Spec}(R)$ such that $(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ is a strictly semistable pair with $\Gamma = S(\mathscr{X}; \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$. Recall that there exists a unique connected curve D in $\mathscr{X}_s$ such that $\mu : \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}$ restricts to an isomorphism $\phi : D \to \mathscr{X}^{\min}_s$. Recall from § 7.1 that F_0^i is the connected component of $\mathscr{X}_s - D$ with $\sigma_i(k) \in F_0^i$.

First, we construct a base section. By Lemma 7.7 (2), there exists an $\widetilde{s}_0 \in H^0(\mathscr{L}^{\min})$ such that for any $p \in \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^{\min}_s) \cup \operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma))$, $\widetilde{s}_0(p) \neq 0$ holds. Set $\widetilde{s}'_0 := \mu^*(\widetilde{s}_0) \in H^0(\mathscr{L})$. Since $\mu(B) = \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}^{\min}_s) \cup \operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma))$, where $B := \operatorname{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cup \operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma))$, we have $\widetilde{s}'_0(p) \neq 0$ for any $p \in B$. This shows that $\widetilde{s}'_0$ is a base section.

Next, we construct a P-unimodularity section. By replacing the numbering $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m$ if necessary, we may and do assume that $P = \sigma_1(K)$. We set $\mathscr{L}_- := \mathscr{L}\left(-(\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_1(R))\right)$, where $\mathscr{W}_P$ is the stepwise vertical divisor associated to P (cf. (7.19)). We have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}\left(\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_1(R)\right)|_D = \mathcal{O}_D(p_0^1)$, where p_0^1 is the point with $\{p_0^1\} = D \cap F_0^1$. Since $\phi(p_0^1) = \operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)$, we have $\mathcal{O}_D(p_0^1) = \phi^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}_s}(\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P))\right)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}_-|_D &= \mathscr{L}\left(-(\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_1(R))\right)|_D \\ &= \mu^*\left(\mathscr{L}^{\min}\right)\big|_D \otimes \phi^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}_s}(-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P))\right) \\ &= \phi^*\left(\mathscr{L}^{\min}\big|_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}_s}\left(-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ is an isomorphism, it follows from Lemma 7.7 that $\mathscr{L}_-|_D$ is basepoint free. Thus there exists $\xi_- \in H^0(\mathscr{L}_-|_D)$ such that $\xi_-(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cap D$. Since $\mu_*(\mathscr{X}_s - D)$ is a finite set of points, $\mathscr{L}|_{\mathscr{X}_s - D} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}_s - D}$. Further, it follows from a similar calculation to (4.15) that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}}(\mathscr{W}_P + \sigma_1(R))|_{\mathscr{X}_s - D} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}_s - D}$. Thus $\mathscr{L}_-|_{\mathscr{X}_s - D} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathscr{X}_s - D}$. It follows that there exists a (unique) section $\eta_- \in H^0\left(\mathscr{L}_-|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ such that $\eta_-|_D = \xi_-$. Since $\xi_-(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cap D$, η_- is nowhere vanishing over $\mathscr{X}_s - D$. In particular, we have $\eta_-(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cup \{\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_m(k)\} = B$.

Put $M := \mathscr{L}_- \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}^{\otimes -1}\Big|_{\mathscr{X}_s}$. Put $\Sigma := D \cap (\mathscr{X}_s - D)$. By the adjunction formula, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} M|_D &= \mathscr{L}_-|_D \otimes \omega_D^{\otimes -1}(-\Sigma) \\ &= \phi^* \left(\mathscr{L}^{\min} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}/R}^{\otimes -1}\Big|_{\mathscr{X}_s^{\min}} (-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)) \right) (-\Sigma) \\ &= \phi^* \left(\mathscr{M}^{\min}\big|_{\mathscr{X}_s^{\min}} (-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)) \right) (-\Sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{M}^{\min} := \mathscr{L}^{\min} \otimes \omega_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}/R}^{\otimes -1}$. Note that it follows from Lemma 7.6(1) that

$$h^0\left(\mathscr{M}^{\min}\big|_{\mathscr{X}_s^{\min}} (-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)) \right) = 0.$$

Since ϕ is an isomorphism, $h^0\left(\phi^* \left(\mathscr{M}^{\min}\big|_{\mathscr{X}_s^{\min}} (-\operatorname{red}_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}}(P)) \right)^{\otimes -1} \right) = 0$ by Lemma 7.6 (1). Thus we have $h^0\left((M|_D(\Sigma))^{\otimes -1} \right) = 0$.

We prove $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. Take any connected component F_0^i of $\mathscr{X}_s - D$. We compute $M|_{F_0^i}$ by using the adjunction formula. Since $\mathscr{L}_-|_{F_0^i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{F'}$, as noted above, we have $M|_{F_0^i} \cong \omega_{\mathscr{X}^{\min}/R}\big|_{F_0^i}^{\otimes -1}$. Let p_0^i be the point with $\{p_0^i\} = D \cap F_0^i$. Then we have $\omega_{\mathscr{X}/R}\big|_{F_0^i} = \omega_{F^i}(p_0^i)$, and hence $M|_{F_0^i}^{\otimes -1} \cong \omega_{F^i}(-p_0^i)$. Applying the Riemann–Roch formula on F_0^i for $\mathcal{O}_{F_0^i}(p_0^i)$, we see that $h^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{F_0^i}(p_0^i)\right) - h^0\left(\omega_{F_0^i}(-p_0^i)\right) = 2$. Since $h^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{F_0^i}(p_0^i)\right) = 2$, it follows that $h^0\left(M|_{F_0^i}^{\otimes -1}\right) = h^0\left(\omega_{F_0^i}(-p_0^i)\right) = 0$. By Lemma 4.4, we obtain $h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$.

By the Serre duality, $h^1\left(\mathscr{L}_-|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right) = h^0(M^{\otimes -1}) = 0$. By the base-change theorem, it follows that the restriction $H^0(\mathscr{L}_-) \to H^0\left(\mathscr{L}_-|_{\mathscr{X}_s}\right)$ is surjective. Thus there exists a global section $\widetilde{s_-} \in H^0(\mathscr{L}_-)$ such that $\widetilde{s_-}|_{\mathscr{X}_s} = s_-$. For any $q \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathscr{X}_s) \cup \{\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_m(k)\} = B$, since $s_-(q) \neq 0$, we have $\widetilde{s_-}(q) \neq 0$.

Let $\widetilde{s}$ be the image of $\widetilde{s_-}$ by the natural inclusion $\mathscr{L}_- \hookrightarrow \mathscr{L}$. Then it is straightforward to see that $\widetilde{s}$ is a P-unimodularity section. Thus we complete the proof of the proposition. □

Now, we are completing the proof of the main result.

Theorem 7.9. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over K of genus $g \geq 0$. Let Γ be a skeleton of X^{an}. Let L be a line bundle over X. Suppose that*

$$\deg(L) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } g = 0, \\ 3 & \text{if } g = 1, \\ 3g - 1 & \text{if } g \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Then there exist $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the map $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TR}^N$ defined by $\varphi := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$ gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

Proof. Let $\Gamma_{\min}$ be a minimal skeleton of Γ (cf. the beginning of § 6). Remark that $\Gamma_{\min}$ is the canonical skeleton if $g \geq 2$. By Theorem 5.21 if $g \geq 2$ and by Theorem 6.5 if $g = 0, 1$, there exist $s_0, \dots, s_{N'} \in H^0(X, L)$ such that the map $\varphi' : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TR}^{N'}$ defined by $\varphi' := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N'}|)$ gives a faithful tropicalization of $\Gamma_{\min}$.

We may and do assume that Γ is a complete skeleton (cf. Remark 2.6). Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$ be the set of leaves of Γ. For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, Proposition 7.4 gives us a model $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{L}_i)$ such that $\mathscr{L}_i$ has a base section $\widetilde{s}_0^i$ and P_i-unimodularity section $\widetilde{s}_1^{P_i}$. Set $s_{N'+2i-1} := \widetilde{s}_0^i|_X$ and $s_{N'+2i} := \widetilde{s}_i^{P_i}\big|_X$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and set $N := N' + 2m$. Further, we set $\varphi := (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_{N'}| : -\log|s_{N'+1}| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$. Since φ' is gives a faithful tropicalization of $\Gamma_{\min}$, φ also gives a faithful tropicalization of $\Gamma_{\min}$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 7.3 that this actually gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ. Indeed, By Lemma 7.3 (1), we see that this map gives a unimodular tropicalization and is injective not only over $\Gamma_{\min}$ but also over $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_{\min}$. Further, by Lemma 7.3 (2), we see that it separates two points that lie on two distinct ends. Finally by Lemma 7.3 (3), we see that it separates any points on $\Gamma_{\min}$ and on $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_{\min}$. Thus we obtain Theorem 1.1. □

7.4. **Complementary results.** In this section, we show complementary results, which shows that the bounds in Theorem 7.9 for $g = 0, 1, 2$ are optimal. First, we consider the case of genus 0. In this case, we have the following obvious result.

Proposition 7.10. *Let L be a line bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1_K$ of degree 0, that is, $L \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1_K}$. Then for any non-zero global sections $s_0, \dots, s_N$ of L, the image of the tropicalization map $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}_K \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ defined by $\varphi = (-\log|s_0| : \cdots : -\log|s_N|)$ is a singleton.*

In particular, if Γ is a skeleton of $\mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}_K$ that is not a singleton, then no tropicalization associated to the linear system of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1_K}$ gives a faithful tropicalization of Γ.

Next, we consider the case of genus 1. We call a smooth projective curve X of genus $g \geq 1$ a *Mumford–Tate curve* if its canonical skeleton (as a metric graph) has genus g.

Proposition 7.11. *Let X be a Mumford–Tate smooth projective curve over K of genus 1. Let L be a line bundle over X of degree 2. Then the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} does not have a faithful tropicalization associated to the linear system $|L|$.*

Proof. It is classically known that for any global sections $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(L)$, the associated morphism $X \to \mathbb{P}^N$ decomposes into the composition of a double covering $\pi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ and a morphism $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^N$. This means that the tropicalization $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ factors though $\mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}_K$. Since the first betti number of $\mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}_K$ is 0, the image of $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$ has the first betti number 0. On the other hand, $g(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}}) = 1$. This shows that Γ_{can} is not homeomorphic to $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$. Thus φ is not a faithful tropicalization of Γ_{can}. □

Finally, we show that when $g = 2$, bicanonical systems do not necessarily give a faithful tropicalization of a skeleton. Remark that the bicanonical divisor has degree 4.

Proposition 7.12. *Let X be a Mumford–Tate smooth projective curve of over K genus 2. Then the canonical skeleton Γ_{can} does not have a faithful tropicalization associated to the bicanonical linear system $|\omega_X^{\otimes 2}|$.*

Proof. Let ι be a hyperelliptic involution of X. Then for any global sections $s_0, \dots, s_N \in H^0(\omega_X^{\otimes 2})$, the associated tropicalization $\varphi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{TP}^N$ decomposes into the composition of: the natural surjection $\pi : X^{\mathrm{an}} \to \mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$, which is the analytification of the quotient of the hyperelliptic involution; a morphism $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^N$; and the tropicalization $\mathbb{P}^{N,\mathrm{an}}$. Since $\mathbb{P}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ simply connected, so is $\pi(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$, and hence $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$ is simply connected. On the other

hand, since X is a Mumford–Tate curve, Γ_{can} is not simply connected. Thus φ cannot give a homeomorphism from Γ_{can} to $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathrm{can}})$. □

References

[1] O. Amini, *Reduced divisors and embeddings of tropical curves*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), no. 9, 4851–4880.

[2] O. Amini, M. Baker, E. Brugallé, J. Rabinoff, *Lifting harmonic morphisms I: metrized complexes and Berkovich skeleta*, Res. Math. Sci. **2** (2015), Art. 7, 67 pp.

[3] O. Amini and L. Caporaso, *Riemann–Roch theory for weighted graphs and tropical curves*, Adv. Math. **240** (2013), 1–23.

[4] M. Baker, *Specialization of linear systems from curves to graphs, with an appendix by Brian Conrad*, Algebra Number Theory **2** (2008), 613–653.

[5] M. Baker and S. Norine, *Riemann–Roch and Abel–Jacobi theory on a finite graph*, Adv. Math. **215** (2007), 766–788.

[6] M. Baker, S. Payne, J. Rabinoff, *On the structure of non-Archimedean analytic curves*, Tropical and non-Archimedean geometry, 93–121, Contemp. Math., **605**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.

[7] M. Baker, S. Payne and J. Rabinoff, *Nonarchimedean geometry, tropicalization, and metrics on curves*, Algebr. Geom. **3** (2016), 63–105.

[8] M. Baker and J. Rabinoff, *The skeleton of the Jacobian, the Jacobian of the skeleton, and lifting meromorphic functions from tropical to algebraic curves*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2015**, no. 16, 7436–7472.

[9] V. Berkovich, *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. **33**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.

[10] V. G. Berkovich, *Étale cohomology for non-Archimedean analytic spaces,* Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **78** (1993), 5–161.

[11] V. G. Berkovich, *Smooth p-adic analytic spaces are locally contractible*, Invent. Math. **137** (1999), no. 1, 1–84.

[12] V. G. Berkovich, *Smooth p-adic analytic spaces are locally contractible. II.*, Geometric aspects of Dwork theory, Walter de Gruyter and Co. KG, Berlin, 2004, pp. 293–370.

[13] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer, R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 261, Springer-Verlag (1984).

[14] S. Bosch, W. Lütkebohmert, Stable reduction and uniformization of abelian varieties I, Math. Ann. **270** (1985), no. 3, 349–379.

[15] L. Caporaso, Y. Len, M. Melo, *Algebraic and combinatorial rank of divisors on finite graphs*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **104** (2015), no. 2, 227–257.

[16] D. Cartwright, D. Jensen, S. Payne, *Lifting divisors on a generic chain of loops*, Canad. Math. Bull. 58 (2015), no. 2, 250–262.

[17] F. Cools, J. Draisma, S. Payne, E. Robeva, *A tropical proof of the Brill-Noether theorem*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), no. 2, 759–776.

[18] P. Deligne and D. Mumford, *The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. **36** (1969), 75–109.

[19] K. Fujiwara, F. Kato, Foundations of Rigid Geometry I. arXiv:1308.4734, a book to appear from European Mathematical Society Publishing House.

[20] A. Gathmann and M. Kerber, *A Riemann-Roch theorem in tropical geometry*, Math. Z. **259** (2008), no. 1, 217–230.

[21] W. Gubler, *Non-archimedean canonical measures on abelian varieties*, Compositio Math. **146** (2010), 683–730.

[22] W. Gubler, *A Guide to Tropicalizations*, Algebraic and Combinatorial Aspects of Tropical Geometry, Contemp. Math., **589**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, 125–189.

[23] W. Gubler, J. Rabinoff, and A. Werner, *Skeletons and tropicalizations*, Adv. Math. **294** (2016), 150–215.

[24] C. Haase, G. Musiker, and J. Yu, *Linear systems on tropical curves*, Math. Z. **270** (2012), no. 3-4, 1111–1140.

[25] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. **52**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[26] J. Hladký, D. Kráľ, and S. Norine, *Rank of divisors on tropical curves*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **120** (2013), no. 7, 1521–1538.

[27] E. Hrushovski, F. Loeser, and B. Poonen, *Berkovich spaces embed in Euclidean spaces*, Enseign. Math. **60** (2014), no. 3-4, 273–292.
[28] E. Katz, H. Markwig, and T. Markwig, *The j-invariant of a plane tropical cubic*, J. Algebra **320** (2012), 853–875.
[29] E. Katz, H. Markwig, and T. Markwig, *The tropical j-invariant*, LMS J. Comput. Math. **12** (2009), 275–294.
[30] S. Kawaguchi, and K. Yamaki, *Rank of divisors on hyperelliptic curves and graphs under specialization*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2015** (2015), 4121–4176.
[31] S. Kawaguchi, and K. Yamaki, *Algebraic rank on hyperelliptic graphs and graphs of genus* 3, Kyoto J. Math. **56** (2016), no. 1, 177–196.
[32] S. Kawaguchi, and K. Yamaki, *Effective faithful tropicalizations associated to adjoint line bundles*, preprint 2016, available at arxiv.
[33] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman, *Affine structures and non-Archimedean analytic spaces*, In The unity of mathematics, 321–385. Progr. Math., **244**. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.
[34] Y. Luo, *Rank-determining sets of metric graphs*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011), no. 6, 1775–1793.
[35] D. Maclagan and B. Sturmfelds, *Introduction to Tropical Geoemtry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **161**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015.
[36] G. Mikhalkin and I. Zharkov, *Tropical curves, their Jacobians and theta functions*, Curves and abelian varieties, 203–230, Contemp. Math., **465**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
[37] I. Tyomkin, *Tropical geometry and correspondence theorems via toric stacks*, Math. Ann. **353** (2012), no. 3, 945–995.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Doshisha University, Kyoto 610-0321, Japan
E-mail address: kawaguch@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Institute for Liberal Arts and Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8501, Japan
E-mail address: yamaki.kazuhiko.6r@kyoto-u.ac.jp